

to 3236

POLITICS & SOCIETY

S H A H I D P R A V I N

POLITICS
&
SOCIETY



PADMAJA PUBLICATIONS
BARODA
NAWAB SALAR JUNG SHAHADUR



First Published 1946

COPYRIGHT
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

: SOLE DISTRIBUTORS :
PADMA PUBLICATIONS LTD.
PHIROZESHAH MEHTA ROAD,
FORT, BOMBAY.

Printed by Kishan Singh Chavda at Sadhana Press, Raopura Barc
and published by Padmaja Publications, Baroda. 25-11-46.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	vii-xi
1 THE CONCEPTION OF STATE AND NATIONALISM ..	1
2 THE PARTY AND POLITICAL ORGANISATION ..	13
3 YOUTH ORGANISATION AND LABOUR FRONT ..	35
4 THE ARMY	47
5 WOMEN	56
6 RELIGION	75
7 LANGUAGE	89
8 RACE AND RACIAL PSYCHOLOGY	99
9 THE PROBLEM OF MINORITIES	113
10 EDUCATION	141
11 LAND POLICY	151
12 INDUSTRIALISATION.. .. .	156
13 PEASANT AND WORKING-CLASS ORGANISATION ..	160
14 STATES AND STATES' PEOPLE	168
15 DECLARATION OF RIGHTS	173

INTRODUCTION

In India we have had enough and more of loose thinking in the domain of politics. The Indian National Congress, the major political organisation in the country, is committed to no determined political ideology. It affords a platform to the most orthodox among the Hindus, Christians, Parsees and Muslims and also to the most radical among socialists and communists. The basis for common agreement is the ideal of independence and as regards the subsequent phase of political development all seem to differ. The socialists by reason of the fact, that some leaders amongst them are in the good books of the Congress High Command (I use this term with no sinister meaning to it) and that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru seems to be sharing their views, are hopeful of a socialist regime succeeding the present order. The orthodox and the religious attach less importance to the presence of the socialists in the Congress ranks; they are just youngsters fluttering around who, when the time comes, can be won over by a few judicious ideological crumbs. In any case, they wouldn't cut much ice, that's what the elders regard. The implicit belief in the survival of Gandhism even after Gandhiji's death confirm their opinion.

Gandhiji's leadership over the Congress has helped him to win large masses of people to the Gandhian Philosophy of life and the pseudo-religious mysticism associated with

it. This, however, does not represent a complete political ideology, in fact, in matters of politics Gandhiji is being led by his younger colleagues, he only forges the weapon for execution, the weapon of non-violence. Apart from his insistence on the principles of non-violence and a programme of village re-construction approaching to conditions existing in the middle ages, on the details of political administration, he has developed an open mind, but that cannot be said, as regards his ideas about social organisation. The ideal society to him is the Hindu society of old, with its emphasis on the family as a social institution and a rigid set of morals and religious life controlling the loose joints. The religious bent of his mind obscures his vision of the society to come, in the shaping of which he himself plays a vital role.

Next in importance to the Congress are the All India Muslim League and the Hindu Mahasabha, the two communal organisations, mobilising political opinion from the point of view of religion. The funniest part however, is that the leaders of both these organisations are non-religious when compared to Gandhiji or Moulana Abdul Kalam Azad of the Indian National Congress. This factor explains a lot about their politics; to fire-eaters, fire-eating is a profession and not a religion. About their political ideology, the less said, the better; in fact, they have none. Pakistan offers a mental *lebensraum* to a mind obsessed by the intricacies of legal practice, in the same way as to an erstwhile revolutionary, to play with fire-works within temple precincts offers an amusing contrast. Their politics may cast a gloomy shadow for some while but not enough to darken the path of political progress. In spite of these, it is the tragedy of our time that one has to consistently plead for a compromise with evil and in anguish question; can we do without that?

From the standpoint of political ideology the Communist Party of India, the Congress Socialist Party and the

Radical Democratic Party merit consideration out of the numerous other parties. The Communists have a definite ideology and a good one at that, but the Indian Comrades have not been able to keep pace with the times and take a realistic view of things. They are more or less Stalin worshippers and to them Stalinism is synonymous with Communism. For this reason, in their hands, the internal politics of India becomes part of the foreign policy of Russia. If the leaders of the Communist Party of India were to learn from Stalin in his relation to Russia's politics, they would have won the people's heart, but they are too small men for it. The rank and file are only trained in abuses, couched in the stock terminology of the Communists, petty bourgeoisie, lackey, traitors and what not and ironically as if the result of auto-suggestion they have themselves become all that stage by stage in Indian politics.

The Congress Socialists on the other hand have been more realistic in their politics, they believe that Communism and Socialism are essentially political doctrines and not testaments to be executed to the very letter of their political testators Marx, Lenin or Stalin. Unfortunately the Congress Socialists cannot be termed as a political party, they represent only an association of young men within the Congress fold, trying to mould Congress opinion on particular lines.

Communists are Stalinists, Radical Democrats are Royists, and Roy is an erstwhile revolutionary. From this one can form an approximate idea of the relationship between the politics of these two groups. At one time people used to regard Roy as a genius, but to-day for the simple reason he has to find company with the bureaucracy and as a corollary to that find solace in a revolution heralded by the liberals, his stock is far too low in the estimate of the people.

India's political problems are complex and to set forth

a rigid set of principles or programme which can be followed for a long stretch of time is almost impossible. I have tried in this book to present an ideology, a solution to some of our most baffling problems and a programme of political and social organisation, which though cannot be the last word of its kind, must appeal to a large section of my own generation. In this presentation I have not stuck to one set of ideology in toto, but have tried to modify and draw upon almost all the existing political ideologies or isms as they are popularly known.

The end of all politics is the good of society and society is composed of individuals. To plan and ensure the happiness of these individuals must be the concern of all.

In presenting the Book my orientation has been towards India and India alone. Solving the destiny of four hundred million people is something worth trying and in doing that I feel we can be all up to ourselves. No other nation can help us do that. It is the conviction of the author that without the economic, political and social independence of the people of Asia, who constitute the majority of the population of the world no orderly human progress on a world scale is possible. The absence of such liberty only accentuates the conflict within the human species, which according to biological principles, as well as the theory of progressive evolution would result not in the survival of the fittest and the evolution of a higher species but in the gradual extinction of the species as a whole or progressive deterioration in the quality of the species. Man in the process of his development has combated with vigour the threat from other species against his existence and has to-day reached that stage whereby he has not only survived but developed to a remarkable degree as to be able to control the forces of nature, to assist him in his progress. The next step for him is to improve upon, on this, by co-operating with his own species and evolve a higher stage on the plane of existence. No lasting world

order is also possible without the two different people, I mean Asiatics and Europeans, uniting on equal terms and it is an essential prelude that these two people must be given for a pretty long time the opportunity to manage their affairs all by themselves. The annihilation of the racial complex would be possible then and then only. No self appointed trusteeship or the application of the principle of assisting the undeveloped people to attain the state of self government would be satisfactory to this.

The Book is meant for the common citizen and I have tried to make it as readable as possible. There are imperfections in the mode of presentation, may be in essentials as well, but these would be remedied in subsequent editions in the light of criticisms forthcoming.

CHAPTER I

The Conception of State and Nationalism

The state is an administrative expediency. For the reason it derives its authority from the individuals comprising the various nations contracting or constituting themselves to form a state, its formation is greatly influenced by historical, cultural, social, racial, geographical, linguistic and economic factors. The nation is an arbitrary union of individuals who by reason of cultural, racial, linguistic, religious, economic, occupational or social affinity, so conduct themselves as to be termed a distinct group or entity through the process of history. It is approaching to an abstract or spiritual concept and for that matter is not real and possesses no authority. It has no concrete function and acts in the fiduciary capacity of an agent when so invoked by the individuals comprising the nation. Both the state and the individual are real and possess authority, which by no means is absolute but guided by and related to the interests of the community and the concept of nationalism. The conception of nationalism may change, so also the needs of the community. Community may be defined as a group of individuals. The individual, though, is the source of all authority does not possess authority over other individuals and in so far as he surrenders them to the state loses authority over himself. The state accumulates all such authority and exercises them for the

benefit of the individual through the agency of individuals. The state may draw its authority either directly from the individuals themselves or through the agency of nations. The individual when acting for the state does not act for himself but is a servant or agent of the state as the case may be and his authority is defined by the state. This is true in the case of the President of the state, to the Ambassador, Minister or the mere menial.

Following the above definition of a nation a state may consist of various nations and have accordingly various nationalisms. For example in a country like India, this nationalism may be of a religious character like Hindu Nationalism and Islamic Nationalism, in countries of the continent it may take the form of racial, linguistic or cultural nationalism and in a country organised on economic basis it may take the shape of occupational nationalism like agrarian or working-class nationalism. There are uni-national states as well, but in such cases the concept of the nation is merged with the state. In such an event the terms, nation and state may become synonymous, though precisely speaking they are not.

Admitting the principle that state is an administrative expediency and the source of all authority is the individual, next comes the question of the extent of this individual authority. Every individual in a state by the very fact of his existence has equal authority, rights, necessities, ability (unless proved otherwise) and aspirations in relation to other individuals and the state. There can be no distinction by reason of sex or age and every individual delegates authority in an equal measure to the state. The unfettered expression of right and authority by individuals and the satisfaction of needs and aspirations in one's own way have not been to the good of all concerned in the past and with the result the state has been created to remedy the defect. But when this state was created the full implications of the rights of the individuals and the fact that the source of all

authority is the individual were not realised and the constitution of the state in itself became imperfect. Selfishness on the part of a section of the individuals and the lack of appreciation of the principle that every individual, by the fact of his existence, had equal rights when compared to other individuals, resulted in the state function being monopolised by few. Unequal extortions and equally disproportionate methods of distribution by the state made the situation worse for the large body of the people and the conditions easy for those who monopolised the state. Since in the early stages the state was personified by the monarch or the chief, this extortion was for the personal gratification of the monarch or the chief and those around him, either relatives by blood or by function.

In the same way as the individual surrenders his rights in equal manner it is the function of the state to distribute the benefits and take care of the individual's rights and comforts in the same equal proportion. A state which is incapable of doing this or is restricted by monopoly or tradition cannot be termed a state in the real sense.

There is a curious misconception that when an individual surrenders his liberty he is reduced to the position of a chattel to be disposed of at the will and discretion of the state. This is opposed to all canons of equity. It is to be distinctly understood that the surrendering of the individual rights and liberties is only to make sure that the individual can have unrestricted exercise of such rights and liberties, which a properly constituted state enables him to do. In a society organised on the present basis and with states constituted as they are, it is idle talk that the individual has liberties or rights. Such rights and liberties are monopolised by a few, even in the so-called Communist countries, while the largest proportion of the people do not enjoy any such rights or privileges but are deluded by the monopolising few through propaganda purveyed in highly sentimental or idealistic strain.

When the basic necessity of the state is properly understood and its functions defined there is unlimited scope for its development. This development should not be confused with the building up of power, either for the sake of individuals or parties as done during the intervening period of world war first and world war second. For a validly constituted state there can be no restriction on the scope of its activities. It may embrace the whole of the economic and cultural sphere and may even extend to religious and spiritual matters. It is the general will, I mean the will of the individuals constituting the state that determines the scope or extent of the state's activities.

The highest development that can be possible on this basis is when every individual acts for the state in some capacity or other and when the state will is understood as the individual will and the will of the individual is fully represented by the will of the state. In such an event the state merges with the individual and *vice versa* with the result that the presence of the state is not distinguished. In this reality the state does not wither away as the advocates of Communism or Anarchism visualise, but the influence of the state spreads so widely and evenly, and its beneficent power, though imperceptibly exercised is fully realised by all concerned. Such a state may even satisfy the spiritual needs of a community for the state in that event fully represents the spirit of the age and of the people. The withering away of a state is impossible so long as man is the basis of society and human instincts and aspirations prevail and it can only be possible when man descends to the level of being incapable of constructive thinking or attains the stage of purposeless entities guided by spirit force. Otherwise by every stage in the development of man the function of the state can only increase and never diminish, for human wants in general are insatiable and in a properly constituted state the opportunities for satisfaction of material and spiritual needs are multiplied

very greatly. The division of labour and the diversity in human resourcefulness can only lead to the multiplication of state functions and to multiplicity in human wants with the result that the state may permeate the whole sphere of nature and human activity. This would sound an empty generalisation but to take a concrete example, will it not be possible one day for the world state to fully air condition all dwelling apartments or change the physical and climatic conditions by harnessing nature and its forces? The amount that has been expended on wars during the twentieth century if properly utilised, may serve to produce artificial rainfall for the entire desert regions of the world, through electric cloud detonators or provide artificial sunshine and heat for the entire arctic regions or build experimental stations in stratosphere, provide artificial rivers and mountain tracts and develop special foods and vitamins capable of bringing about far reaching biological developments. Will such a definition of the state and the extension of its functions justify the deification of the state, is a question naturally to be asked. The answer can only be emphatically in the negative. It is illogical for the state to be regarded as anything but an administrative expediency and in any case, a state can never be an absolute entity, as pictured by the forerunners of all present day political theories. Added to this monarchy has no place in the future organisation of society nor the dictatorship of an individual.

Even in the so-called Communist country, the glorification of national leaders as amounting to deification, has only restricted the scope for the development of Communism. The necessity for strong leadership is only a temporary expediency, while the enlargement of the scope of the individuals with the added facilities for their mental development would lift them out of the rut of being led by greater men. This does not, however, mean that in the process of establishment of the state the role of the capable

and the disinterested leader, who exercises supreme authority and discretion is ruled out, for any expediency that would contribute to the progress of society has a definite place in all future plans of organisation. Instead of being deified it is just possible that a state may become so natural and all embracing as nature itself, its effect and necessity being felt as that of air or water and its authority so powerful yet so unnoticeable as that of the conscience. Just as our conception of the state is not mythical, its functioning also can have no mythical significance. The state and the general will constituting the state are both conscious realities to be felt and realised and to be subjected to all manner of enquiries and this realisation being its essential source of power and validity, deification or absolutism are outside its pale of significance.

Since the question of the deification of the state or its leadership has been ruled out as irrational there can arise no question of the deification of the concept of nationalism or of the party controlling the state. There has always been the danger of nationalism being raised to the level of a supreme cult or idealism by the very fact of its unreality, but the deification of the party has been only a remote contingency except in the early spiritual orders. The elimination of this unreal and secondary concept of nationalism can only be accomplished by affording full opportunity for its forces to play out and thus prove the futility of the idea and the incapacity of it to be of material or spiritual value to the people. Its deep rooted significance cannot be denied and no amount of palliatives would mitigate its influence. unless of course, chance is given for the germ to come to the surface. The effect of applying direct remedies in the hope of suppressing or eradicating the virus would be to unevenly distribute the whole thing throughout the body politic resulting in highly painful eruptions in a sporadic and widespread manner.

From this we may pass on to the consideration of what

could be the essential functions of a state and the role of nationalism. By the very fact of his birth, man acquires his right for existence. In the present day world under the influence of capitalism, this right for existence has been denied to large sections of the world's population. Such a state of affairs is contrary to the very principle of life and the state primarily constituted to take care of individual rights and protect individual liberties is thereby bound to interfere in the sphere of economic action. Since there is no other way of assuring an equitable distribution of the necessities of life, except through the co-operative effort represented in the state, all the sources of production have to be concentrated in its hands. Land being a part of nature, just as air or water and is as vital to the existence and orderly progress of mankind as these two elements are, individuals cannot be left in undisputed possession of it nor can individuals exercise the right of sale or barter of land. All rights affecting land will have naturally to be vested in the state which is the only real representative of the general community and use of land for the purposes of residence, agriculture and industry will have to be guided by the laws framed by the people in the interests of the whole community so that individuals may derive the fullest enjoyment out of the resources of land. Subject to common agreement and expediency for tactical reasons, nationalisation, (I would prefer to use reversion to nature, natural reversion or some such other word which is more approaching to the real sense of the process) may be partial or complete to begin with, but ultimately and theoretically land should at all times be regarded as constituting nature and vested in the state by common agreement for common benefit. Until such time the state is fully organised and is capable of taking the entire functions of production, distribution and the guidance of social relationships, some of these functions may have to be partly left in the hands of the individuals, groups or nationalities and the cost of these

met out of taxation, but in the ultimate scheme of organisation, taxation will give way to voluntary co-operation with state functions and voluntary participation in benefits accruing out of the general community activity.

Related to the question of taxation is the problem of money. Money as a convenient but arbitrary measure of value and a token for exchange cannot possibly be replaced for a long time to come or perhaps never, but one thing is certain that money will only exist as a convenient measure of value or token of exchange and not as the all powerful mammon which it is to-day. Of course anything bearing the sanction of the state can take the place of money, metal, paper or whatever thing the state chooses, for, money as such will have no intrinsic value. Its use in the future society will have to be restricted to minor exchange functions, while a large variety of services to the state or the community would be rewarded either through popular vote or tokens. This would be a sufficiently strong safeguard against the possibility of accumulation of capital by individuals and the abuse associated with it. For example, the personal and exclusive use of an automobile when automobiles are scarce, will have to be controlled by popular vote or state authorisation, while the use of it as a general means of transport will be a state service and availed of as such. In the matter of distribution of food and clothing the war has taught even the capitalist Governments, the principle of equitable distribution and in post-war planning of society it would be wise to build on this principle and avoid the chances of mal-distribution of essentials for life.

In the sphere of administration of law and justice it is likely that we may have to enlarge on the present modes of state craft, at the same time throwing a large mass of present day laws on to the dust heap. Since the function of the state is to ensure the maximum of individual welfare and liberty, this can only be accomplished by the state regulating the entire sphere of social relationships. This

cannot be left to the concern of arbitrary conceptions like religion, nationalism, custom or ethics which are of doubtful validity by themselves. For example, the law regarding marriage or divorce, both affecting individuals vitally and the law regarding inheritance and individual liberty cannot be left on such undetermined planes as at present.

It is well to consider at this stage the desirability of separating the judiciary from the executive. This is perhaps the best method so far conceived in the absence of a satisfactory plan, whereby the administration of justice can be separated from the sphere of politics. A legal authority superimposing state authority has yet to be conceived and the suggestion of the establishment of an elected judiciary seems to be still impracticable for this very desirable idea might hamper instead of assisting the smooth functioning of an effective state machinery. No hard and fast rule can be evolved all of a sudden without practical experience of various alternative schemes proposed by different authorities. It is, however, less likely that the function of administration of law would be taken entirely out of the hands of the state, so long as the state is regarded as the fountain of justice and the law making authority. It can be stated by way of principle that in regard to crimes against the state, the trial by a permanent judiciary constituted by the state is imperfect, simply for the reason that the judiciary by reason of its constitution, is incapable of exercising an impartial judgment. And even if it could do so, there is still less likelihood of such a judgment being given effect to, if that happens to be against the state.

One basic fact needs to be insisted upon generally and that is the place of capital punishment in the administration of justice. It is opposed to all canons of human justice and its inhuman significance is more pronounced in the case of political crimes. The most regrettable feature is that capital punishment for political crimes is meted out more commonly in the so called advanced countries of

Russia and Germany one under socialism and the other under National Socialism, than in countries like England or America. In the case of political crimes one has to consider the fact that an offence against a state organised on a particular basis may turn out to be no offence at all in a subsequent stage in the history of the same state. To take a more concrete example; the very idea of political agitation or expression of political opinion may amount to a crime in an autocratic state at one stage, while at another stage, such offences are not taken count of at all, for evident political reasons. If capital punishment were to be meted out to Lenin, Stalin or to Mahatma Gandhi, under what canon of justice or expediency the present day Russian Communists and their henchmen throughout the world, would justify such action I can't imagine. They may explain such methods as political expediency or invoke the conception of a superior law for the state, if it happens to be constituted according to their will. It is no justice nor is it justified by the doctrine of Communism and such action can only be interpreted as amounting to barbarism. If anybody tries to justify capital punishment it is because he has bartered his free will to political tutelage of a very mean order. There can't be two definitions for democracy, one suited for the purpose of Communists when they are out of power and another suited to their needs when they are in power.

In recent years, we have also witnessed the peculiar procedure of arrests and imprisonment for protracted periods of time without trial which are themselves negation of the principle of law and justice. In an ideal state, such high handed methods can have no place, nor do such expediencies help in the functioning of a state in the long run.

Crimes as between individuals are more easy of trial and solution than are crimes between individuals and the state, between states and states, between the party and the state, and between the state and the nationalities.

One set of judiciary may be found suitable for a particular type of offences, while the employment of the same type of judiciary for another set of offences may be extremely injudicious. When the state goes wrong the people take the law into their hands and dissolve the state, if such a procedure is possible. In such an event the constitution of the judiciary is accomplished in a different way and the enforcement of their judgment still more differently.

Can nations or nationalities, as distinct from the state have the power to legislate or administer law is a question which needs further elucidation. The rule is, where nationalism and all that it stands for can be defined precisely the nationalities can be invested with such powers as would be beneficent for the people represented by these nationalities or nations. If it is religious nationalism then the sphere of legislation or authority should be restricted to religious observances only, when it is a combination of religious and cultural nationalism the powers can be amplified in a like manner. But where religious observances or religious laws are found to be discriminating as between individuals and individuals and between different sexes or sects the abolition of such practices or laws is a condition precedent to the establishment of a valid state and when such a state is constituted the entire responsibility for the administration of these principles of common justice devolve on that state. This is by no means an arbitrary conception, but is justified by a far superior law, of the state guaranteeing the maximum of individual liberty.

The boundary of a state is not a fixed unchangeable thing. As circumstances demand the boundaries can be extended, contracted or sub-divided to suit the needs of administration. The principle governing such action is not any idealist philosophy represented by the terms provincial autonomy, principle of self-determination, federation and confederation, but a matter purely concerned with administrative expediency, just as the state is constituted

for the purpose of orderly administration of individual needs. If union of provinces or states with states add to the benefit of the whole lot of people such a procedure is justified even against the wishes of a dissenting minority, for here again in the absence of any other alternative for the determination of the common will, the application of the principle of majority decision seems to be the only satisfactory solution. To assure the smooth running of the newly constituted Union, and to do justice to the dissenting minority, it would be found necessary to grant safeguards to the dissenting section of the population, but these safeguards should in no case go against the very principle of the Constitution or the common good of the people.

CHAPTER II

The Party and Political Organisation

To the average mind in India British and American Democracies with more than one political party to contend for power are more representative of the people than the one party governments under Fascism or Communism. This is mostly due to concerted propaganda on the one hand and upbringing on the other. The Indian is educated under a system which is purely British inspired and for every problem he is required to draw upon English constitutional history and British institutions for solution. He is cut off from his own cultural moorings and has little access to the cultural resources of other nations except England. The educated Indian, who is naturally called upon to give political lead to the country is thus often more English than Indian. An English mind is suited to analyse English problems but when confronted with Indian problems its approach would be unrealistic and impractical. Many even among Congressmen not to speak of other political figures in the country belong to this category--persons who by training are English-minded but by circumstances are forced to think seriously about the solution of Indian problems.

Quite recently another set of ideas, mostly of continental origin have invaded the country and those are pertaining to the ideologies of Fascism and Communism. I should

think these have more in common with Indian ideas than the Parliamentaryism of England or the Congressional Democracy of America simply because continental conditions are more similar to India than the conditions obtaining in England or America. American Democracy is a product of British Democracy and Indian Democracy according to the present trend of thought if allowed to develop would grow in all likelihood on similar lines. Americans have been resourceful enough to modify the British system to suit their peculiar needs, but Indian politicians, mostly lawyers trained in British constitutional law and its hybrid appendix, the Indian constitutional law and history, have not so far displayed any such capacity. In England the political parties are pulled together by one set of common interests, *i. e.* love of the country, maintenance of a high standard of living and consequently the upkeep, governance or exploitation of colonies and large scale industrialisation. In America, until lately, being away from the political turmoil of Europe, their interest have been to keep law and order to enable the citizens to develop the vast resources of the country and live their lives fully. But with America exhausting her resources in the face of a highly industrialised economy with increasing unemployment, her political policy is being patterned more and more over the English model with the vision of an empire or a secure market for her products to keep the home fires burning. In to-day's circumstances and for our purposes both the American and British systems of Democracies are the same. They are suited to their own peculiar needs and are evolved for that purpose. Whether it be Labourites, Conservatives or Communists, if they want to be in power and run the administration of England under the present conditions without effecting violent changes in their internal politics, they will have to govern in almost the same manner as at present. They will have to run the colonies, they will have to maintain world markets and for

that purpose spread the myth of British impartiality, piety, goodness, democracy and what not and to be perpetually interested in the sub-division of Europe and the maintenance of the balance of power between the countries of the world as a safeguard. So it does not matter to the Englishman whether there are more than one party to contest for power, for, he is pretty sure that Labourite Attlee is as much English as Conservative Winston Churchill, Fascist Mosley or Communist Pollitt. Certain people would be surprised by the latter part of my statement in regard to Fascist Mosley and Communist Pollitt. I can say to them that if ever Fascist Mosley or Communist Politt wants to come to power, he will have to become first and foremost an Englishman and then anything else and if he becomes one he will be bound to support all that constitute present day England and her Empire.

To us in India the needs are different. Our first concern is to be free from the economic and political domination of a foreign power, for with that is bound up the problem of finding food for the starving millions. Without the economic development of the country it is impossible to feed the people and for economic development political power and freedom for action are absolutely necessary. The fulfilment of our needs, since these clash with the needs of England and such other powers who are interested in the exploitation of India, can only be accomplished by vigorous political action. The independence of India cannot come as a gift from Englishmen, however beneficent some of them may seem to be. From this understanding the democracy suited to us in the intervening period, from now on to the attainment of our objective, is the democracy of the Army, one will, one purpose, one party and one leader. This does not mean we should run away from any discussion of democracy.

To a dispassionate observer the Democracy obtaining in England or America is only the fulfilment of the interests

of one class by the other section of the population, who are deluded by all talks of freedom and equality. Just as a man to save himself from hunger willingly courts death by enrolling in the Army, the common mass of people in order to satisfy their immediate necessities of life, subordinate all their rights and liberties, including their sweet will and common sense to the other party. If England declares war on Germany for marching into Poland, it is because English Capitalists find in the rising Imperialism of Germany a potential danger to their markets and monopoly interests, and not because of any humane considerations or sympathy for the unfortunate victims of Poland. But to attain their object in as subtle and glorious a manner, they din into the ears of the public the atrocities of Nazi Germany, the sufferings of the poor victims and all the noble sentiments of helping the weak and the poor, and in this the Press they control and the leaders of the political parties they have brought to power are their instruments. The ununderstanding mass of the people from the important civil servant to the unimportant char-woman and the spinster maid in the country, become victims of this propaganda and their blood begins to boil at the Nazi guilt and their hearts begin to melt with pity for the Polish people. In the act of the declaration of war against Germany they find the vindication of the spirit of English nobility, English steadfastness to moral principles and character, and in such self-induced hypnosis they volunteer to lay their lives, surrender their liberties and force themselves to regimentation and sign themselves off for a period of ruthless post-war exploitation of themselves and their progeny by the very same people, who have led them to the war. Unwittingly these people work themselves up to such mad frenzy that they try to blow up the heads of all those who try to argue against their foolhardiness, and press for legislation for penalising such objectors and for conscription of all young men and women in their bloom,

leaving aside the senile and the decrepit to go scot free for all their past guilt of exploitation to enjoy a further period of economic prosperity artificially manoeuvred. When these people are sacrificing their lives, their party leaders and those sinister behind-the-curtain representatives of vested interests responsible for all this cruel warfare, may be negotiating for foisting all sorts of Governments over conquered countries whether acceptable to them or not, and for world monopoly rights, war contracts, and formation of commercial corporations for monopolising Indian and Empire trade. During the same period through the agency of their own Government, if large number of unarmed innocent men and women are wounded or die on the streets of India by lathi or bullet for the crime of demonstrating for their country's freedom and still more thousands languish in the prisons and millions of her people die of hunger there are not many tears shed in England nor do the World Press or public feel any moral torpor about it. The denial of freedom for four hundred million people of the world, the thousands of innocent men and women who have perished during the successive waves of national agitation beginning with the Rebellion of 1857 are all to such people, the fulfilment of a highly beneficent, self-imposed mission. If this is all done in the name of Democracy, better we have nothing of the like in our country.

Democracy has a greater significance than the mass following of a political party or the perpetuation of a system of Government in which a large majority is deluded to partake, through all sorts of artifices, bribery and self-deception. The new conception of Democracy is different from all these. It implies the administration of justice and fair play with equality of opportunity and means for the satisfaction of material and spiritual needs for the entire mass of people. The old definition of Democracy, that is, the Government of the people, by the people, for the people, falls short of this ideal, not by reason of the

imperfection of the definition but by the peculiar interpretation which has been given to it. A government in which the majority of people willingly partake and subscribe to need not be a democracy. It can be the vilest of dictatorships either by a financial oligarchy or a party or an individual. It may still have the pretence of being by the people for the people, but assessed in the real sense of democracy it may prove to be a sham affair. The real needs of a people and the ways and means of satisfying such needs may not be clear to the majority of the people themselves, and those few who have any conception of such are either incapable of giving expression to it or putting into practice through all sorts of disabilities including the ignorance of the many. Can that mean that the people have no real needs apart from the bare few which are presently being satisfied and that they do not aspire for anything higher than what they can afford at present.

From this it would be evident that at a given time in history, the needs of the people then living, may not be clear to a large body of the people themselves, and it may be left to a thinker or prophet of the age to assess, give expression to or explore and find out the needs and aspirations of such people. The inert consciousness may be there inspired by life in that era, but it may or may not come to life during the same age or at the time when such dawning of consciousness is mostly needed. This conclusion may be challenged by orthodox communists, for, to them history is a convenient plastic to be shaped to their will endowed with a purpose and inevitability, perfectly timed and set to clock-wise regularity. I do not disparage the Marxist interpretation of history in this, but I am only referring to the tendency of present day Communists in general to drag history in support of everything including the silly statements they issue from time to time.

The fulfilment of this democratic idea whether inspired by the prophet or the times, is the essence of democracy.

It is not the existence of the idea on paper or widely diffused in the body politic that matters, but its accomplishment. If the accomplishment is possible, only through the dictatorship of an individual or a class, then such dictatorship is that democracy. If it is more convenient or is only possible through a one party Government then that Government is the only democratic Government. Parliamentarianism, if it fulfils the function can also satisfy the definition, provided the idea is so permeated throughout the body politic and forceful enough to pull all the parties together like the race complex in the case of Europeans.

It is the idea that is infallible and not the prophet or the protagonist. To take a more concrete example, Newton's law of gravitation is infallible but not Newton himself. In politics, however, we can't have that much of infallibility, but still a political theory or philosophy may be basically correct under the current circumstances and still remain so for a considerable stretch of time. But it would be folly to ascribe the same quality to all that the originator of the idea feels or thinks. One may be qualified to talk on politics, but for that reason his ideas on Aerodynamics need not be correct. If we analyse correctly and reason with sobriety most of our political ills are due to the canonisation of politicians or the originators of political theories. The field of religion is no exception to this.

To us the basic necessity is therefore, to avoid the pitfalls arising out of canonising the politicians or making prophets of them. There is only one way of doing that and that is by making the idea or the ideal supreme, instead of the person propounding or fulfilling it. A party attached irrevocably to the idea for the fulfilment of the ideal can only bring the substance of democracy to all.

Can a skeleton idea, shorn off all embellishments which make a thing appealing succeed by itself is what we have to consider next. So far as political ideas are concerned, efforts at the dissemination of such ideas have not met

with significant success. Abstract ideas at best gain currency as mere philosophic concepts through the ages, but ideologies attain a different significance and are capable of inspiring people for definite action. These ideologies are built up around a central idea and all the things which make up a concrete ideology are knit together to satisfy the urge. The idea of a classless society in itself in Marx's understanding, did not possess the urge, unless reinforced by a concrete philosophical background and a social and moral significance. The philosophical background and the social and moral significance which form the setting of the ideas of Marx, were essentially suited to Europe, where conditions even to-day are different from those obtaining in India. I should also think that Marx did not take into account the emotional and irrational in man, in his treatment of the subject for such conceptions as Nationalism and racial affinity find little support or significance in his essentially scientific analysis. Lenin in his application of Communism to Russia went a step further and took into consideration the emotional and the irrational conceptions as well. I find no reason to criticize Marx for this, for Marx was discussing the whole problem from the theoretical standpoint while Lenin was faced with the reality of applying the theory to practice. The Communists in India including Mr. M. N. Roy and his camp followers have, however, been oblivious to these factors and each set in their turn claiming to be the custodians of Karl Marx's conscience have tried to apply the Russian adaptation of Marx's teachings in toto to India.

One such precept from which we have to differ is in regard to Marx's definition of the Bourgeoisie or rather the petty Bourgeoisie and his analysis of their mind and their political role. To Marx the term signified more or less its dictionary meaning, i.e. in French a townsman trader and his whole analysis was based on this conception. This Bourgeoisie are a feature of European Society and their role

and importance in India have been exaggerated. I have refrained from using this term entirely, because our middle class are of a different composition and their role is consequently different from that of the Bourgeoisie in Europe. I have not been able to spot out an equivalent of that term in any of our Indian languages (I mean thereby a word in common usage as distinct from a forced Sanskrit or Persian equivalent) and even the Bengali term "*Bhadra lok*" is not anywhere near it. In the same manner a proletariat in the European conception of the word, is absent in India and the term "Dictatorship of the proletariat" does not portray the same meaning or has the same significance as in those countries. On the contrary, the dictatorship of the proletariat, cannot be a democratic conception at all for India, where the working class is still a small minority and the bulk of the population is composed of the peasantry. Even the urban worker is in part a peasant, and the distinction between the middle class, the worker and the peasant is not of a very concrete nature. Orthodox communists may be disposed to compare the conditions here with Marx's description of European semi feudalism. Such comparison can only be partial and any attempt at solution of India's problems, based on this conception of Marx's European semi feudalism, must meet with disaster on the rock of reality.

Another thing which needs more than passing attention is the theory of Decolonization propounded, repudiated and taken credit for simultaneously by M. N. Roy, whereby the punch out of communist agitation has been side-tracked. This theory supposes that by gradual evolution the colonies and dependencies would attain the position of equal partners in the Commonwealth of Nations and for that reason, no great importance should be attached to the struggle for national independence in these colonies. The arguments advanced for this is that capitalists in the mother country would find it of advantage to come to working

arrangement with the capitalists in the dependencies or colonies for the joint exploitation of the people. This theory does not take into consideration, the political, social and racial factors which restrict the operation of this sort of evolution, and developments during the past twenty-five years have amply demonstrated that in relation to the colonies and dependencies inhabited by coloured people, these other factors have more direct bearing than the purely economic. There is no historical inevitability attached to the idea, and if one presupposes such an inevitability it can be due to base political motives or lack of impartial judgment to assess the relative importance of various social and emotional factors affecting political developments. The spreading of the idea of historical inevitability in regard to either Communism or progressive evolution defeats the purpose of history, by substituting placidity and unconcern in the place of action and awareness. It is vitally necessary that this counterfeit political doctrine should be eliminated from our body politic.

Reverting to the organisation of a one party Democracy I feel one should not be content with a mere academic discussion of the subject leaving aside all practical considerations. To the Englishmen the idea of a one party Government must be an anathema so must be all things aimed at the unification of India under a strong Government. Britishers go round saying that the Indian National Congress, ignoring or purposefully covering up the fact that it is the only purely political organisation representing the greatest majority of the people, wants to set up an autocratic one party dictatorship in the country. Even if this interpretation be incorrect, I think we should take up the challenge in right earnest. There is no sin in asserting that what we want exactly is a one party Government, for that is to us the fittest translation of democracy into action. Democracy does not mean to us loose thinking

and loose acting, but a determined orderly Government to assure the maximum of benefit to the entire people. If our vision of a Government falls short of this you have a right to criticize but not otherwise. The party represents the people, (I mean people of the soil excluding all half caste hybrids torn between conflicting attachments and ideologies) and Government by such a party is the nearest to Government by the people. If it in anyway has the semblance of dictatorship it is only the dictatorship of an idea and the fulfilment of our wants and not the domination by an individual or clique for personal gratification. To us different parties can only mean loose thinking and pulling of the chain in different directions and thereby the perpetuation of all our ills including the subjugation of the people by foreigners.

Let me pass on to the consideration of how this idea and the substance of democracy can be put into actual practice within our country. Accepting the fact that Congress is the party of the people (I do not need any authority in support of the statement except the self evident fact and the widespread recognition of it) is it possible for the Congress as it is constituted today to fulfil the function? A loose knit mass organisation cannot succeed as an efficient administrative organisation without making drastic changes as regards its composition. One would ask at the same time can we afford to sacrifice its mass character at this stage to meet the needs of administrative efficiency? I wouldn't suggest it at all, for the strength of a political party depends on its mass support and I would even visualise that one day Congress would mean India and India would mean the Indian National Congress in the sense, there would not be a single citizen in the country who is not a Member of the Congress. My suggestion is to retain the mass character of the organisation and if possible to extend it, but at the same time to build up a cadre within the organisation composed of men who would stand

above petty communal bickerings, devoted to one cause and self sacrificing to the extreme. This cadre, organised and well disciplined within the party would be the controlling factor in the party organisation. They would be elected from amongst the party members, but it is essential that none shall be eligible for membership of the cadre unless he subscribes implicitly to the party principles and programme and if needed willing to sign a party pledge to that effect. That is the only positive way to force the ideal and the ideology to the foreground rather than the party and the party leaders. The necessity for organising such a cadre within the party is dictated not by one reason but by many. Next in importance to the principle of organisational efficiency is the insurance against the unscrupulous trampling of minority rights and interests and a more detailed examination of the problem would be attempted in the Chapter dealing with the minority problem.

In Russia under Communism, the Party ideal has been kept in tact as far as possible by restricting the membership of the party to selected individuals. There they look to quality rather than quantity. Whether they have succeeded in that or not is a question for them to decide. Their party organisation has been subjected to periodical purge from within necessitated by rivalry between persons and policies. I mean the Stalin-Trotsky feud. Out of all this the Party has emerged as the mouth-piece of one man, the winner in the struggle and to-day the members do little thinking. It was alright for Stalin to do that but we have no need to glorify one man and our ideals are different. We do not want to sacrifice democracy, but at the same time want to curtail a lot of loose thinking and have a party organisation which would concentrate on the job in hand. The democratic nature is assured by the mass character of the party and since the people would elect the cadre from amongst themselves (here I mean by the term people the general membership of the party) they would

be representative of the people but at the same time devoted to the cause. In the other case it is the existing party members who would decide as to the admittance of a new member, thereby it is all the more likely that all such new members would conform to one pattern. A party of that type will be rather an army of recruits like the civil service and such an army of hirelings would be the least suited to guide the destiny of a nation or contribute to its genuine political progress. They would be like the cogwheels in a bureaucratic machinery with the difference that this new bureaucracy has a high sounding revolutionary note about it, but the result would be all the same, substitution of one bureaucracy for another. My criticism of this is not on the point of administrative efficiency, for the civil service have done wonderfully well in the administration of things dictated to them, but is on purely democratic principles. The cadre I visualise will not be composed of hirelings but of men with the greatest sagacity, intellectual awareness, broadness of outlook, impartiality and willingness for sacrifice, youthful in ideas, united and pulled together by the spirit of service and the high purpose of an ideal. An orthodox Communist is presently the reverse of all these and if you doubt my statement, all that you have got to do is to find out one and just talk to him. Apart from his stock vocabulary he is devoid of any sort of intellectual awareness or tolerance. I am talking of the Indian variety. What we want is men of extreme tolerance and impartiality and men who would not stoop to pick up anything that falls on their way.

There is much talk these days, studied and otherwise on Provincial Autonomy, Federation with and without residuary powers for the federating autonomous units and on unions. If one visualises India as a powerful administrative unit capable of withstanding the tempest blowing outside, he has got to regard all these talks with the greatest amount of suspicion. Provincial autonomy in India is

a creation of the foreign rulers of the country to split the unity of the people on some pretext or the other so that their domination over the entire continent may be assured. By playing to the vanity and sectarian instincts of the people, Provinces which were originally created to provide for administrative facility have been nursed into rival units and as breeding grounds for inter provincial jealousies and feuds. There are still a large number of people who support the idea of Provincial Autonomy, but if you analyse the working of the minds of these people you will come to know on what a slippery ground they stand. Some of them have borrowed the idea from their Communist friends, who gloat in and out of season, on the autonomous units of the Soviet Union and their right for secession. They try to impress on you the success of the Soviet measure, but at the same time display their lack of understanding of the reasons behind the consummate unity of the Soviet Union. If you look below the surface you will find that this unity is as a result of the party and its organisation. Behind all the empty phrases of autonomy and right of secession the party which reaches into the fabric of society holds all the conflicting forces to form a compact unit which if left alone would fall apart and disintegrate.

From this it is not to be surmised that I am opposed to the idea of autonomy for the Provinces. I am opposed to the habit of putting sentiment before reason and the view that whatever has been tried and found successful in Soviet Russia ought to be the criterion for us. If we begin to look at things in that manner there would be no end to the crop of suggestions coming forward, Democrats of a particular school would say that the United States is the most fitting model for India and the constitution of the United States should be the basis of our constitution and all their ways of life should be transplanted here. My reasoning is that the administration of our country should be on a basis which suits our needs

most rather than be evolved out of leanings to particular countries or to particular set of notions. In our complex system of development right from the primitive to the highest form of industrialised society, we need a Government sufficiently strong at the centre capable of harnessing and utilising resources on an ever increasing scale with a purpose and an ideology to unite the conflicting and disintegrating forces within the borders and at the same time not autocratic and rigid but constituted in a spirit of understanding and tolerance and capable of being adapted to changing needs. In the evolution of such a scheme of things, we can be aware of developments elsewhere, but such developments should not cloud our vision to the exclusion of all and bar the type of introspection, which would prove to be the most essential and useful. If we take the pressing problems of our day, we will find that every one of them is a matter for co-ordinated effort on an all-India scale rather than being things peculiar to one province or one set of people. In such an event is it possible to solve such difficulties piecemeal by provinces autonomously constituted without the assistance of a more widely planned machinery capable of drawing upon the resources of the entire country? If we take the realm of law, we find that most of these have been evolved out of a policy of giving sanction to religious customs or injunctions and these religions are not restricted to one province or the other. With the progress of society most of these laws have become out of date, objectionable and unsocial in tune with the religions inspiring the codes of procedure. The replacement of these laws by a more social, equitable and rational set of laws would be a stupendous task in the face of religious fanaticism which the provinces by themselves would not be competent to handle without the interference and assistance of a more central authority, possessing a wider scope and sanction for legislation. It has also to be considered that on the impact

of rational and revolutionary ideas vested interests with a view to retain as much as possible of their out of date ideas, laws and customs and for the purpose of consolidating their interests would clamour for more and more of autonomy for the provinces and even press for separation if that is possible, for in that they find the safest refuge from the sweeping forces of reform. For these reasons it would not be wise to encourage the growth of the idea of Provincial Autonomy and the fictitious conception of a confederated Republic or Union of Units possessing rival claims and ambition on the basis of their very composition.

But before condemning the idea of Autonomy for Provinces or the federating units, I would like my readers to assess for themselves the validity and substance of these claims. In the field is the Muslim League composed as it is of vested interests aided and abetted by various other agencies, putting forth the claim of a separate state for the Muslims, though the demand for a separate state is camouflaged by the substitution of the word Nation for the State. But the real demand is for a state with all the implications of it, meaning that the protagonists thereby want to have administrative control over this region, with a view to ensure their perpetual domination and also to restrict the growth of a united India, carved as it would be by progressive forces. The substitution of the word nation is with the purpose of trapping in the masses, by appealing to their sentiments for without their backing, all these claims would be mere empty wind. Dupes can only be counteracted by dupes and realising fully the fact that when sentimentalism catches hold of the mass mind you cannot do away with it easily except by satisfying it and proving to themselves how evanescent is the pleasure of sentimental satisfaction. For this reason, I do not find any objection in acceding to the demands of the masses, that is the constitution of separate nations in the country to be termed autonomous, supreme or super

supreme. At the same time this does not mean that we are handing over the people to these representatives of the vested interests.

The division into provinces or autonomous units from the theoretical standpoint is only calculated to facilitate administrative efficiency, but as a second consideration these can be utilised to afford sentimental satisfaction to the minorities and the people of the provinces who are disposed to view life from the sectarian or provincial standpoint because of past association and tradition. At the same time it should not be lost sight of that this satisfaction is only secondary, while the major objective of developing a powerful and unified state, should always be in forefront of those who are engaged in the planning of the administration. The internal workings of the minds of such planners need not be made public to this section of the population for obvious reasons. With a view to strengthening the unity of the country, the organisation of the party should be so extended as to cover every field of political, social and administrative activity particularly through the agency of the *cadre*.

In the organisation of these Provinces or even say autonomous units, the Indian National Congress has given a lead by setting out the principle of linguistic division. This is extremely sensible and perhaps the most convenient, but I would go even a step further and sub-divide these linguistic Provinces if a certain section of the minority want it out of sentimental craving and allow areas predominantly composed of such racial, cultural or religious minorities to function as separate units or Provinces. It does not harm the unity of the state by allowing such minorities to constitute themselves into separate Provinces for by the very reason of their smallness and lack of resources, they would find it more and more necessary to develop their dependence on the Centre, or in other words this division would be the greatest incentive for union. In a society organised on an

entirely different basis from the present, I mean with socialised means of production and distribution and with a powerful and deeply organised state, primarily constituted for the benefit of the individual, there would be less reason for the Provinces to be discontented or to seek separation from the union. Some people point out the analogy of Ireland or of the smaller nations of Europe as arguments against the desirability of such divisions. If the Englishmen would have been a little bit more far-sighted and devoid of sectarian instincts (equal to our provincial or communal feeling) Ireland would not have been a separate state to-day. The very denial of freedom for Irishmen and the imposition of English domination over them drove them to the other extreme and made them irreconcilable. To me more than anything else, the common conception in England that Irishmen are inferior to the pure English caused the estrangement, while to the more pretentious there may appear to be other reasons. All the other things have developed out of this primary feeling of inferiority complex, and here in India if we do follow the same attitude as the English, we will have ere long many such Irelands irreconcilably separated from the rest. Coming to the question of Europe, it can be said that the division of Europe is not by the choice of Europeans themselves. It is due to the interference and intrigues of the Anglo-Saxons that Europe is divided, and at various stages in the history of Europe, Europeans themselves have tried to shake off the fetters imposed by the Anglo-Saxons and form themselves into a United Europe. But such efforts failed simply because there was not a sufficiently clear ideology to guide these efforts and those who attempted were ambitious militarists and not popular leaders. Here in India as well, there would be endless divisions, if only we allow foreign agents to muddle with our politics. In Russia with an area much larger than that of Europe and nationalities more diverse than any other country, there is no such insistent demand

for independent states primarily because these foreign powers can have no access there. Once the powerful Russian state is defeated, there would be no end for the division of Russia. By the peculiar composition of the Communist party and the realistic attitude of its leaders, the state has withstood the tremendous blows and machinations of foreign powers with singleness of purpose unrivalled in history. That is the example of Russia to us living with all the reality of it. On the contrary look at the Americas, the North is a united whole with even the prospect of absorbing Canada in its fold by the wish of Canadians themselves, while the South is torn between the aims and ambitions of rival imperialisms. If the South can be united through the same bloody process as the North, I feel there would be much more cause for satisfaction for the South Americans themselves than at present. It needs courageous planning but in any way accomplishable and well worth trying just as the unification of Europe for the sake of Europeans.

Inseparably connected with the idea of a unified India is the Capital of this new India. For more than one reason the present Capital, that is Delhi, is unsuited to be the capital of the new India we visualise. The choice of Delhi as capital was made when the ruling class looked to Persia and Central Asia as their abode and centre of inspiration. To us the need is for more and more of introspection to trace out all the sources of our inner strength and make use of them to fulfil our destiny. There is something akin to the spiritual in this. A man in his undeveloped stage looks up towards a greater personality than himself, may be God or his prophet to inspire or guide him and as his source of strength, but as he progresses more and more, instead of looking up, he tries to look within himself and around him for the same purpose and with greater benefit. When Delhi was constituted as the Capital of India, the state for which Delhi formed

the Capital did not extend to the same boundaries as the present day India. The entire regions of the South never owed allegiance to this Capital in spite of the fact that their unity with the Greater India existed all throughout. From the practical standpoint also Delhi was central to Akbar's Empire, but the present day India is not the Moghul India, but an entirely different one. To-day whether through British power or through any other cause, India has reached its original dimensions, the real India which existed from time immemorial. In this statement I am going far beyond the vision of our present day historians.

Apart from these considerations, the Capital of a modern State must be situated as centrally as possible. For such a thing as a National Newspaper, Delhi as Capital is hardly suited. For a paper published in Delhi, to reach the farthest corners of India would take the same time as the Mail from England takes to reach India in normal times. Moreover, Delhi though connected by rail with the major sea-ports is not a natural meeting point for such rail connections nor is it a centre for any other vital system in the country's organisation. For the matter of a traditional attachment, and that too not very old, we cannot sacrifice the needs of naval, military, transport and administrative control and make Capital of a city far too remote to be the nerve centre of the whole country.

To meet all these considerations the new Capital of India should be somewhere in the Central Provinces and Nagpur being virtually the centre of India and a fully developed city with direct rail connections to the three major sea-ports already and with possibilities of extension, seems to me to be the best choice. This city is so to say equidistant from Madras, Bombay and Calcutta and its distance from the Himalayas and from Cape Comorin are almost the same. As a centre for aerial transport it can serve the entire continent with the greatest ease and rapid-

ity than any other city and culturally it strikes a happy medium between the puritanism of the South and the exoticism of the North.

Another matter which weighs for consideration is the language. With Delhi as the Capital of the Republic of India, Hindusthani the future *lingua franca* of the country is bound to take a greatly Persianised and high flown diction with an accent which would be more foreign than Indian. Even before Hindusthani's attaining the exalted position of a state language there has developed a tendency to deride the Hindusthani spoken by other Provincials as something far too below the standard of Hindi or Hindusthani and the notion that their accent and pronunciation sound incredibly bad. For this reason a South Indian or a Bengali has to feel constantly that he is inferior to the pure Hindustaniman in his knowledge of Hindi simply because of his accent, though he might develop the capacity to write or speak a more expressive and vigorous language by reason of his scholastic bent. The only sphere in which Hindustani is recognised as national to-day is in the films and in that Hindustani has not justified its claims to be an all India language simply for the reason that it has excluded other provincials from taking part in it for the reasons given above. Will it not be curious and unseemly if Englishmen claimed that English English is the only correct English and Englishman's accent and way of speaking the only tolerable one. How unpleasant an effect the spreading of this false conception can have on the American movies, and from an identical reasoning neither the Americans, the Canadians, the Australians, or the South Africans would be regarded as speaking the real English, the English to be appreciated and admired. Hindusthani as a national language will have to fulfil two roles, one of a provincial language for the present day Hindusthanees and the other of a national language with a wider scope and appeal and a consequential latitude in its rendering. Such a development can only be

possible if the language is brought down from the Moghuls at Delhi to the level of the countrymen far and wide.

CHAPTER III.

Youth Organisation And Labour Front.

Successive waves of national agitation have proved beyond doubt the necessity for organising the youth movement on a sound basis and in co-operation with the party. At present youth movement can be classified into two broad categories, students organisations and youth leagues. The political youth leagues are mostly sporadic outgrowths like the Vanera Senas, and others are organised by some of the communal parties. There was a time when opinion was divided on the question of drawing the youths particularly the students into the political orbit, but to-day most of the political thinkers and leaders have realised the full significance of youth activity and regard the youth as inevitably tied as the adult with the political cause. Mahatmaji has realised this and on the eve of every national agitation sponsored by him, he has appealed to the youth and the student community in particular to plunge headlong into the struggle along with the adults. At times under instigation of personalities like Rajagopalachari and others he may have expressed opinions in favour of students not partaking in politics, but such inconsistency is in the grain of Gandhiji. In this one cannot blame him, for it is mostly an effort on his part to please his colleagues entrusted with responsibility. Rajagopalachari when he occupies the ministerial gadi steps into the shoes of another bureaucrat

and acquires the same mentality and attitude towards life as his predecessor. To a bureaucrat students' participation in politics is quite uncomfortable and a thorn in his side, and Rajaji when he acts for the bureaucracy has to feel and act in the same way. But when he descends to the level of the political agitator, I should think he would not be inclined to lay such a hard and fast rule. Inconsistency is a weapon in the political armoury in the use of which all have got to be accomplished to become expert politicians, is the view that guides these gentlemen.

Youth is endowed with romanticism and awareness, two qualities greatly helpful for development of the mind if properly utilised. If left alone these generally develop into activities which dissipate energy. In their zeal for effort they become victims to the machinations of religious propagandists, communal fanatics or politicians. Every one of these set of people plans to trap in the emotional youth to his fold to gain momentum for his cause or activity. The history of the students movement in India is a fit example for the result of such activities. There are rival Students Federations controlled by Royists, Communists, Muslim Leaguers, [Hindu Mahasabhis and Congressmen all pulling the youth in different directions. The net results have been disillusionment for the youth and disaffection among themselves on an unprecedented scale.

For the simple reason that one man does not feel inclined to draw the youth into the orbit of political activity, they are not going to remain or to be left alone like that. There are others who would volunteer and interfere in the activities of the youth and mould their minds. From this it would be clear that it is the function of the party whether in power or not to extend its scope and activity to draw the entire youth community into its fold. So long as the party is not in power it may be desirable for political reasons to organise the youth movement distinct from the party but this has got more disadvantages than advantages.

At any cost if the youth movement is organised in sympathy with the party, it would be subjected to the same surveillance and repression by the Government and it would not matter much whether it is independent of the party or not. If it is independently organised it is all the more likely that when the crucial time comes the leaders of such independent organisations would be inclined to keep out of trouble and just to cover their own weakness would bring in the excuse of their independence. The exercise of such restraint by the leaders would be resented by the majority, naturally on similar occasions and this would result in the disruption of the movement. Further the organisation on an independent basis would offer an incentive for people of entirely different ideology to take control of the movement. A country and its party cannot afford to take such risks and let go the youth to founder on the rock of conflicting ideologies and disintegrate.

Having come to the conclusion that the youth organisation should be controlled and guided by the party we step to consider as to how best this should be done. Youth being an adult in the making his needs and aspirations cannot be very different from that of the adult. Youth life must be a period of essential preparation for adult life and youth activity must be coterminous with adult activity. Students by necessity form the majority of the youths and all youth organisations will have, therefore, preponderance of students in them. But should these students be organised separately from the other body of the youths is next to be considered. Such a separation seems to defeat the entire purpose of the youth movement as an organic whole by creating artificial barriers between youth and youth. At the same time one cannot ignore the sentimentalism of the student community and their existing prejudices. To satisfy both it would be necessary to organise students councils within the youth movement, separate in name if necessary but not in substance, and functioning

directly under the control of the general youth movement. Hard contact with reality can only drive away the prejudices and bring about the fusion of the entire body of youths into one organisation. One with a little bit of knowledge of the psychology of school boys would realise by what I term prejudices. Students are disposed to think of the other youths not engaged in studentship as somewhat below their standard. They regard not only such youths but also adults with almost identical feeling for their vision of the world by association of ideas is that of some sort of scholastic order where scholastic distinctions alone count. Their tendency would be naturally to resent being yoked with all such people whom they look down upon. The glory of being identified with the party is a direct remedy for this and control by the party would establish the liaison. Details affecting students exclusively will be left to the consideration of these students' councils within the youth movement while the general direction and control of activities will be done by the youth organisation which in itself would be a section of the party.

What type of activity should demand the attention of the youth movement in general is the next point to consider. Admittedly labour is the most sustaining of all activities and the satisfaction gained out of it endures longer than any other. Glorification of labour is the best incentive for creative effort and actual work leaves little room for stray thoughts or petty bickerings. For these reasons youth activity should take the form of useful labour to the community and its fulfilment must be made the most glorious of all actions. This combination of the national youth and labour front should be the criterion of effective youth organisation in the future. In the use of the word labour front one should not confuse it with the idea of mere factory labour. It only suggests what type of activity the youth organisation would take and for that matter has no other significance, nor will such national youth and labor

front embrace any class of people engaged in labour as such. It would signify a mere youth organisation with the distinction that such organisation is wedded to the idea of labour rather than platforming or publicising.

With an educational system reformed on the basis of the activity school, this youth labour front can assume a greater significance. In India a country mostly composed of agricultural villages, such youth organisations and labour fronts can be of very real service to the villagers. For example there are villages without adequate number of wells, tanks, buildings to house schools and dispensary, while in most of the villages there are no reading rooms, radio listening and recreation centres. Most of these deficiencies can be remedied by the local branches of the National Youth and Labour Front through voluntary labour and with materials, equipments and facilities willingly contributed by the villagers themselves. The youths can go on camping expeditions to neighbouring villages to provide the villagers with similar facilities. Youth parties from the towns and cities in the absence of opportunities for similar activities in urban areas may take out expeditions or conduct explorations and excavations in the country.

The activities enumerated above only give an outline of the nature of work on which the youth can be profitably engaged. In addition to these they can be put under training in such occupations as smithy, carpentry, masonry and other useful labour under the guidance of the village carpenter, blacksmith and the mason. These should not, however, be regarded as a training for occupations but as purely voluntary activities to draw the attention of the youth and bring them into contact with the realities of life and the problems of existence. This will also help in putting down social barriers and false middle class pride and prejudices. Such contact with the youth would inspire a new purpose and outlook in the minds of the old village folk like the carpenter and the blacksmith who upto now have been

regarded as out-castes or untouchables by force of religious customs. There cannot be a more effective way than this to bury such obnoxious customs and who else can be more fitted than the youth for the accomplishment of such revolutionary tasks. Such activities should not be regarded as a sort of imposition but purely activities in the form of cultural recreation and in the taking part of which the youth should attach a special glory and be proud over it. Such an attitude can be infused by propaganda if necessary.

If the party is in power Military Drill or training can also be included, but so long as these are restricted, such knowledge can only be imparted through suitably designed sports which illustrate in relief the essentials of such art. These would be very valuable in the life of a citizen and as such youths have a right for initiation in these arts as well. In advocating such a policy one has got to consider the possibility of such measures being mistaken by the authorities as subversive activities and banned in which case the entire youth organisation will be subjected to constant repression and vigilance. For the reason however one cannot entirely rule out the beneficent effects of military education or a similar system of physical training for the youth.

Apart from the youth, the labour front activity should form a basic principle in the organisation of the party and should be extended to adult members of the party as well. Hitherto, politics in India has been regarded as mere talking, lecturing, issuing statements, writing pamphlets, journalism and contesting for elections. The essential nature of politics, that is nation building activity, has been overlooked by all, because it is not a function so easily accomplished as the rest without sacrifice of personal comforts and developing a sense of duty. Jail going is regarded as the acme of political sacrifice with the result that people thirsting for popularity voluntarily court imprisonment. To ambi-

tious young men in the professions politics is an avocation which helps them build up their career. There are others, rank opportunists who realise that prominence in Congress activity is the surest way to merit Government recognition and many of our gallant knights are fitting examples. These things prove the desultory way in which political activity has been conducted in the country. There are causes for it. Politics in India has been viewed as mere agitation in the furtherance of which, propaganda, jail going and electioneering are the essentials for the creation of a wide national opinion. Even the leaders have not for a moment thought over the full implications of politics and the mode of organising a political party. Independence is a mystic conception to most of the people, like Sorel's idea of general strike, the fulfilment of which might take place in God's own good time in this generation or the next or somewhere somehow. It might as well come as a gift or through change of heart or by a process of liquidation of the Empire by presenting a petition for it. There are ardent supporters for every one of these ideas and there are leaders prepared to bet with their lives on the truth of their assertions. To realists however, politics has a different meaning, political activity a different significance and method and they have a clear vision of the why, when and how of the whole thing. Even Gandhiji himself does not entertain any idea of winning independence in his own life-time and for that matter his ideas are as vague as that of others, though at times in the height of emotion on the eve of his favourite Satyagraha movements he might have declared that Swaraj would come within one year through methods soft and swift. That is not, anyway, the type of vision that would bring result.

If a new significance is to be given to politics in the country, I think political activity should take a different shape altogether. The new political activity must take the form of labour on a national scale organised by the party

on a purely voluntary basis. Labour is not only the most lasting propaganda on account of its results but also the most redeeming and sustaining activity. This labour directed on nation-building activities is the surest method to strengthen the party and bring politics to the domain of the lowliest of the lowly. To cite a concrete example of how this nation building activity helps strengthen the party one has to look to Behar and compare the position of the Indian National Congress prior to the earthquake in that province and subsequent to that. The Indian National Congress under Gandhiji's guidance, one cannot deny, has on various occasions taken part in nation building activities, but the defect is that it has not been regarded as one of the main functions of the party and organised to that end. Gandhiji I should think has realised fully the value of labour and his programmes of Charka, village industries and the cult of service bear testimony to this. But the way these have been presented and directed leave much scope for improvement.

It is a matter of human psychology that the mind is influenced more by the philosophy of power than by the spirit of sacrifice or appeal to the faculty of reasoning. Demonstrative action kindles the vanity in man's mind and vanity, you might call egoism, is the base on which this philosophy of power is built. On account of this it should not be taken that the philosophy of power is in itself bad and not worth encouraging. Power when applied for good things is beneficial to the development of society and vanity of a right type is an ennobling quality. It depends on the manner in which these qualities are utilised. An individual is left alone realising his limitations feels himself a puny creature, but in a large congregation his vanity and sense of power are increased. Militarists, more than anybody else, have realised these psychological traits of men, while intellectuals and men with spiritual bend of mind have shown apathy to the consideration of such emotional

qualities. Military drilling, band music, demonstrative parades are all calculated to increase the individual's vanity and power and to divert his mind away from the limitations which bind him to the ordinary level of existence. A soldier marching to the tune of a military band feels himself as the greatest hero, though to the casual observer he is only one amongst the many, a sheep in a herd. His emotions are in high tension and in his heightened imagination he moves in a plane far above the level of common existence. All his noble ideals including the sense of sacrifice are brought to the surface and a man who would ordinarily try to avoid the slightest risk would face any and every danger. Intellectuals and spirituals on the other hand argue that man by reasoning and by deliberate thinking develops the sense of sacrifice, but in formulating such a theory they are only looking to themselves. An ordinary individual very often loses his self-control by deliberate thinking, while a bit of emotional excitement would soon pull him up for any sacrifice or action.

The labour front activity for the reasons cited above to gain the maximum benefit should be conducted on a collective scale. The irksome nature of work is greatly lessened by collective effort and in a group effort a man would be willing to subject himself to a type of work much harder and less congenial than what he would be disposed to do when left alone to reason.

There cannot be laid any hard and fast rule as to the nation building activities on which the adult labour front can be engaged upon. As in the case of the youths activity may embrace from the building up of bridges to road building, waterwork schemes or the building up of power houses and sanatoriums and general hospital and nursing work. It might be asked whether this labour front activity would be a full time activity or not. If the labour front is to embrace the entire section of the party and the community it cannot possibly be made a full time occupation. Since all labour

front activity would be voluntary the work would be done mostly on holidays and in spare hours. There would be apprehension in the minds of many as to how much concrete work can be accomplished in spare time out of voluntary effort and in disjointed groups. To them my answer is that the whole activity is not designed for the sake of getting things done but to infuse a sort of confidence in the minds of the people, to set their minds on fixed jobs and concrete ideals, to train them for concerted action and to save their minds from being polluted by ill-timed communal and religious propaganda. Even in the sphere of work, I should think, a lot of things can be accomplished. I cite the example of my own village where we were lacking one good road to connect the neighbouring village and the railway line which passed through that other village, for considerable length of time on account of the natural barrier of a chain of hills between the two villages, not of course, of very considerable height. A two-mile road-way through the hills would have set the whole thing right and would have saved for the villagers the circuitous route of six miles for the conveyance of things to and from the Railway Station in the other village, but no one was there to do it in spite of petitions to the local authorities, canvassing of votes for its members, bribery and all other means for the reason that neither the Taluk Board nor the District Board had the sufficient funds or the interest of getting a roadway done in a far off village. The same thing with the assistance of a local labour front group could have been accomplished in no time and saved the villagers all the worry and anxiety.

I came to know of the Indian National Congress for the first time, when I was hardly ten years old, when vast areas of our Taluka were in floods and the Indian National Congress was the first to set up relief work. In those famine stricken times we in the village had to thank much the Congress for the splendid relief work they did in time,

while it took months for the Government to think of any relief measures. I along with other children in the village came to know of Congress from the word "Congress rice," which was being distributed free for some time and thereafter for nominal price.

In recent times, organisations have been started, mostly on communal and religious lines, utilising drilling, parades and other propaganda techniques to rope in large bands of young men and women as followers. Lacking any sort of progressive ideology these organisations have been able in a very short length of time to enlarge their membership simply because of these parades and drills and unfortunately to-day large bands of young men are gradually being trained to become rank communalists or religious fanatics. To save these young men and women from such claptraps is a national responsibility if not a political necessity.

Orthodox communists would criticize such measures as savouring of Fascist technique, but I would like to draw the attention of these gentlemen to their own Russia and its youth movement. I once suggested to a small political group about the desirability of organising a volunteer body with these ends in view, but the leaders broke their heads discussing the theoretical implications of the whole thing and finally dissuaded themselves from implementing the suggestion, on the pretext that the whole idea seemed to them to be savouring of fascist origin. I only felt pity for these dialectical materialists dabbling with history and scientific thought, at their unawareness and ignorance to assess the relative importance of common place elements of human psychology. Their reasoning is something like that of the idealist idiot who finding the thief making use of an available pole to jump over the wall felt to himself that it would amount to copying the thief in making use of the same pole to jump over while pursuing and preferred to scramble over the wall and in such futile attempt let go the thief.

Another useful result of the labour front movement would be the development of useful habits and a correct attitude towards life. In company with other men a large number of uncleanly habits would wear away which would otherwise be impossible with any amount of moralising. The sluggish way of life to which we Indians have become used to, a sectarian and communal or religious outlook on life all these things can be set right by drilling the people to a new tune of life and in such effort the labour front activity can be of immense benefit.

CHAPTER V

The Army

In the establishment and the subsequent administration of the Republic of India, the army will be the deciding factor. So long as the European nationals are obsessed with the fear of the coloured races of Asia, Africa and the rest of the world building up their own governments and systems of administration to the detriment of Europeans who have colonised these countries, the orderly development of India will be constantly menaced by the threat of actual war or internecine conflicts, engineered by these European powers. Independence of India would mean the end of white man's domination in Asia. The hatred of Asiatics by Europeans is for two reasons. The first is racial, that is since the coloured people are numerically the largest, the European mind always harbours the fear of the coloured people one day or other dominating the world and wrecking their vengeance on the white races for all their previous wrongs. It is on account of this that when Europeans talk of any system of world order, they visualise the whole of Asia as a colony for Europeans and not as independent states with equal status and rights. The second reason is economic. The entire economy of European nations is built on a parasitical basis on the resources of Asia with Asia serving as the supplier of raw materials, cheap labour and a market for manufactured articles. That is why

every European war has been fought for the conquest or repartitioning of Asia in recent history. With the development of these Asiatic countries into independent states capable of managing their own affairs, European economy will receive its shattering blow and European standard of living will register a decline. It is this dreary prospect of a lowered standard of living that haunts the European, whenever an Asiatic country tries to build up its own administration. For these reasons, for a considerable number of years to come, it is mere idle talk to think of any world order in which Europeans and Asiatics will be able to co-operate whole-heartedly. The whole conception of superiority of Europeans over Asiatics is built on this fear complex.

I should think this fear on the part of Europeans is not full justified. Lasting peace of the world can only be built on a more solid foundation than the complete subjugation of Asia by Europeans. When I say Europeans I include Americans as well. In the independence of Asia and in the organisation of a Union of Asia composed of all Asiatic countries, with a separate and independent Union of European Nations can alone the peace of the world be assured. Under such a Union, neither people will have reason to be obsessed with the fear of one set dominating over the other and the way will be paved for complete co-operation between these two Unions (and say a third Union of the Americas and Australia and a fourth of Africa) including the exchange of raw materials and commodities. Instead a World Federation composed of both Asiatic and European nations will be untenable for the simple reason that this Federation would not be in a position to assure justice for either. Europeans would not agree to equal representation with the Asiatics on the basis of population man to man, for that would amount to a majority of Asiatics on all world councils. At the same time it would be unfair to the Asiatics to agree to any

weightage for the European nationals. In addition to this unless both the people live and mend their ways for some time on equal status independently of each other, there would be no likelihood of the superiority complex of the Europeans vanishing. Following the principle that for any such sentimental idea the best procedure to counteract it is to give full scope for its development and then when it matures the growth would die away altogether. The best thing would be to expedite the full development of the Asiatic countries to the status of equality with European nations and when once this has been accomplished, there would arise the opportunity and the mental attitude for co-operation between the two set of people on a world basis. But such an idea would not be accepted and carried into effect by the mere enunciation of it, nor by its universal propagation. That task would be accomplished in a more difficult manner by trial and error, and who knows through protracted strife and even war.

There are others who deny existence of racial animosity and who attribute no importance to the racial theory. To me they seem to be living in a fool's paradise, either they are unable to grasp living realities or are purposely deceiving themselves and the world by shutting out relevant facts from the realm of intelligent observation. However, these people are not numerous and in spite of all their efforts at theorising, public opinion hasn't shown any appreciable leaning to their view point.

For the reasons cited above, it would be imperative for the State of India to build up an army for powerful than that of any other single power or combination of powers likely to threaten her independence in the near or distant future. India, in time to come, will also have to share the leadership of Asia and for this purpose her army would be called upon to play a very prominent role in the fight for the consolidation of power. Peace in Asia can only be possible through the preparedness of Asiatic powers to meet

any and every challenge with the fullest measure of armed might. Apart from this, the threat of counter-revolution will be a constantly recurring feature in the early years of the Republic, particularly when power is transferred to the broad mass of people from the present propertied classes and industrialists. This would be engineered and assisted very greatly by foreign powers interested in the perpetual exploitation of the country.

In the future development of politics an army which is divorced from the people, I mean thereby a professional army in the present sense of the word, will be ill-equipped to meet these types of threats, one from within and the other from without. In almost all the countries national armies are being built up on a basis of wholesale conscription and it is likely that this tendency would meet with no appreciable change after this war, even if the war aims of all the countries engaged in the fight remain as at present. The talks of an international police force, to assure peace and similar talks are mere bunkum while none of the politicians in the warring countries are prepared to surrender the least of privileges or power. So far no concrete peace aims have been formulated except that of joint exploitation of Asia by the European powers, upon which almost all the big European powers are fully agreed. That in fact would be no basis for a lasting peace.

An army of the people can only be the real safeguard against a military dictatorship. Recent political history is full of instances of the army taking sides with the counter-revolutionaries in the establishment of the most undemocratic of regimes. Fascist *coup d'états* have been accomplished invariably in this manner while in some of the South American Republics during the course of the present war itself dictatorships have been set up under fictitious democratic labels. Marx's dictum of arming the peasantry and the workmen still remains the only solution to counteract this threat of counter-revolution from within.

A professional soldier can never be ideologically perfect for the simple reason that a man who sells his life for a living would sell his patriotism or political conviction for a lesser price. A citizen soldier is not like that. He has got a stake in the regime and in the upkeep of his citizenship rights, unlike the professional soldier whose interest is after all his living and the rest a matter of heel clicking, hell clanking business. To a citizen soldier the pride is not in his uniform but in his undying spirit and his devotion to the cause and the source of his command the people.

A citizen army is the only economical and possible form of army in a progressive republic of the type we visualise. In such a state the major part of the expenditure for army would be for its equipment rather than for the upkeep of the personnel, and this would enable the army of such a state to be equipped with the best of equipment as compared to the armies of other states who have also to reckon with the feeding of a standing army. I do not mean that such a Republic would be devoid of a standing army at all, but that its expenditure on the standing army would be the least when compared to other states, for the majority of its personnel would be reserves to be called up when required.

The development of such an army would necessitate military training being made compulsory for all citizens at a particular age and for a particular period every year, up to a certain maximum age. This in no way is a bad procedure, for by any sort of education, man is a gainer and not a loser and for that matter military education of a correct type can be made to be the finest character training for an individual. In this respect, I have the example of the Red Army of Soviet Russia in my mind rather than the standing armies of the Fascist or the so-called Democratic states. The citizen army man will not don his uniform except while on duty, and for the rest of his time would wear his civilian dress and be bound by civilian laws.

The parading of military men in uniform is with the idea of ranking the military as a separate class by itself superior to the civilians endowed with special powers and authorities. Such class distinctions should be regarded as opposed to the principle of social equity and every attempt should be made to tear away all sorts of social and caste distinctions. The General in uniform is in no way distinguished from the civilian in less pretentious clothing.

Regimentation and drilling may be helpful in promoting a strict sense of discipline, but these should not be regarded as the only means for that. The most disciplined individual is the really educated man and the mental quality cannot be artificially imposed by physical gesticulations. Pretensions and shows do not fit in with a society which aims at social equality. The best training that a soldier can have is not only physical training but mental training as well. The capitalist way of military censorship has been imposed with the sole purpose of keeping the ordinary soldier ill-informed and thereby assuring his perpetual slavery to this inhuman system. Enlightenment, particularly political enlightenment is seriously discounted by all old school militarists, who claim that the function of a perfect soldier is just to obey and be prepared to die. This is as out-of-date and unreasonable as the very system which contributes towards its existence. The citizen soldier on the contrary will have to be keenly aware of his responsibilities with a lot of initiative and enterprise and a faculty for clear and reasoned thinking and not a blind follower. As a citizen he is a political force and this he does not forfeit by becoming a soldier. He is a soldier because of his keen political consciousness and not because of hunger. One who becomes a soldier to save himself from hunger is a sort of hireling and not a soldier in the real sense.

Should this citizen soldier be subjected to constant political spying as his counterpart is being subjected to in

Russia under the system of political Commissars attached to the Army? In a truly benevolent regime with a good party organisation, there would be no necessity for such a system. The army cadet will get the same political and cultural schooling as any other man and for that matter he is just another citizen. If he does soldiering as a main occupation he is doing that just as a farmer farms or a workman works in a factory. That is the job assigned to him by the state for the time being. I find no reason why this man should be viewed with such a suspicion until cause for suspicion arises in which event, of course, it would be a matter for police observation just as in the case of other citizens. This would be only necessary in a regime built upon suspicion and feuds and not in a Government which is evolved by the people for their own good.

The skeleton standing army which the state is forced to maintain for strategic reasons will not be merely a drilling machine but a living army which takes part in other activities of life. I do not think military training should occupy all the time of a man's career to the exclusion of other occupations. A soldier can take part in other activities of life and yet be a soldier on the point of duty just as a railway signaller, guard or watchman who does his job and yet finds time to be a citizen. For this reason a soldier can be a family man attached to his family and yet attending to his duty and conscious of it in spite of his family ties. While camping out or when drafted for special duty he may have to observe enforced separation, but that should not be taken as a reason for the discouragement of marriage among privates. Normal sex life on the part of a soldier is as much necessary and permissible as in the case of any other citizen and he should not be subjected to any other set of rules or principles in this regard.

Organisation of an army on communal lines would only tend to accentuate communal differences. The aim of military training is to habituate the individual to front line

conditions and at the battle front one cannot have communal food or communal preferences. The encouragement of such preferences is absurd and I do not think a wounded soldier would shout for Hindu *pani* and refuse Muslim water when offered. The mere existence of such a system as obtaining at present would not justify its continuation, for the simple reason that its introduction is deliberate and calculated to foster communal differences. In a popular Government supported by the will of the people there would not even arise such demands. The presence of any such tendency can be very effectively nipped in the bud by the people themselves or by the Government through drastic measures if it is suspected that such tendencies have been engineered by counter-revolutionaries.

In many of the modern Republics, notably in Turkey and Soviet Russia, women have been drafted for military duties even in peace time as a national policy, while in other countries this has been the case only in war time. There is nothing objectionable in the measure and in more than one way the policy is commendable. It would be the best means to redeem womenfolk from serfdom and the fittest answer to the lie that women are the weaker sex needing men's protection. That would afford women the opportunity to realise their own importance and help them build up the correct attitude to life, that is, of equal right and responsibility with men in every day life and in civic affairs. The general conception to-day regarding women is something like the European's attitude towards Asiatics, meaning that they are a class by themselves, inferior and needing special protection, with this difference that in one case it is the urge for sex monopoly, while in the other it is the urge for economic monopoly. In Europe the entry of women to the military field has been necessitated by man power shortage than out of idealistic leanings. In India for a long time to come, perhaps never will we be confronted by such a situation, but that should not mean

that women should be denied the right for military training.

However, drafting women for actual warfare is objectionable on one ground, that is they would not be in all cases required to fight with women but with men. This is an inequitable proposition, though it would not be possible in an actual war to stipulate that women battalions should be met with women battalions. Even if there be such a code it would often be found advantageous to the aggressor to break the rule than to adhere to this moral code. The best procedure so far as India is concerned is to formulate that though women would be given the opportunity for military training in the same way as men, their function during actual war should be restricted to non-combatant services, nursing and hospital work and generally to replace men in the civilian occupations.

Changes in the present conception of the rigid army discipline are bound to come for two reasons, one due to the changed political consciousness and the other due to the general tendency with all armies. As the totalitarian aspect of war is bound to increase with the distinction between the military and non-military front wearing down, individual initiative would tend to be recognised more and more.

To Trotsky should go credit for the addition of the word Commissar to the Communist terminology. This word has been chosen for obvious political reasons and in the same manner the new army would need many such new words to indicate the true functions under the new political ideology. Instead of Marshall or Commander the terms Directing Private, Field Associate, or similar variants would be more appropriate and expressive under the changed conditions of political outlook. The more we try to tear away the high social distinctions attached to the military caste, the better for the world and for all.

CHAPTER VI

Women

All through the ages of history among the various struggles of men the one for the suppression of women has been going on imperceptibly, because of its peculiar significance. To an astute observer this struggle has all the significance of a major class struggle, but it has escaped common attention due to the fact, that, through the indispensability for reasons of sex of one for the other, the less aggressive, of the sex have accepted as inevitable their subordinate nature to the other. Man in return, has not shown even that much of chivalry to acknowledge the situation, but has in fact justified his high-handedness by moralising on it, and to make the humiliation irretrievable, he has put economic fetters on women. If any one doubts the veracity of my statement, he has only to look to the Hindu Community in India amongst whom women are denied the rights of inheritance or divorce from wedlock. This is equally true of Catholic Christians.

The magnitude of the tragedy could be gauged from the fact that this has resulted in the economic, cultural, social and political slavery of more than one half of mankind and restricted the progress of human civilisation equally. In any programme of political and social regeneration the emancipation of women who form the majority of the world's population looms large. This emancipation is as

much a necessity as the annihilation of class distinctions.

The subjugation of women has proceeded apace with the progress of capitalism. Capitalism in its process of creating unemployment on a world scale scored the first triumph by making women unemployable and fully dependent on man for economic existence. This has been made possible by the propagation of a sense of one-sided artificial morality and the bunkum of a general conception that women are a weaker sex needing the protection of men. By the success of the suffragette movement and the existence of the right of divorce it has been claimed that the emancipation of women is complete in countries where these two rights are recognised. These two rights amount to the same as the rights of working men to form trade unions and the right to strike work, and if one tries to console himself by pretending that when these two rights are conceded to the working man, there is nothing left to be desired for that class. What about the other rights and the question of finding work for all ?

Fascists in their appointed task of defending capitalism with all the violence at their command, have decreed that the occupations for women are restricted to those of cooking and of rearing children. In defence of this it is argued that women are endowed by nature with the responsibility of the propagation of the species, and if one is disposed to counter the argument in the same vein that it is the equal responsibility of men as well, that would lead to the situation that the task of both men and women would be to eat and mate continuously for all length of time. The apologia of this special responsibility of women is deliberately conceived and the real explanation is that they along with their capitalist bosses are afraid of the serious consequences of the general entry of women into the field of work when they are already confronted with the problem of finding work for all adult males. To add a streak of silver lining to this dark horizon these apologists have assigned the

realm of culture to women, but we shall examine this statement closely subsequently.

Without economic independence it is impossible to conceive of independence in any other sphere. In any scheme of things, therefore, the first essential is to assure this economic independence for women as a whole. Under capitalism this would be impossible of accomplishment, for not to speak of women, the system has not been able to provide work for all adult males and has instead thrown away large numbers of men as scrap heap on the world's labour market, uncared for and unfed. Any measure which would attempt to reconcile capitalism with the idea of emancipation of women in general, founders on the rock of reality. Socialist planning alone can accomplish this, stupendous though the task would be, but nevertheless, to be accomplished, by peaceful means or by any other one can think of. Ordinary individuals, as well as majority of the leading lights of capitalist administration, find it beyond their capacity to visualise planning on such a large scale and become sterner apologists of capitalism to cover their deficiency.

To us in India, the problem of finding work for all able bodied men and women should not seem staggering and prevent us from embarking on this bold venture. The necessity for all work is the satisfaction of human wants and so long as human wants remain, there would be work for all. Wants in themselves are insatiable and it is an irrefutable fact that in a society planned on Communist lines there can never occur a situation in which idleness would be imposed on majority of the population for lack of work.

The generally accepted statement that women are the weaker sex is not supported by the science of biology. It is just another superstition spread in justification of the subjugation of women. According to actuarial observation, the average expectation of life in the case of women

is longer than that of males and from the point of view of capacity for endurance and the general degree of resistance against disease women are better fitted by their constitution. No doubt, certain types of work are unsuited for women in general, because of the peculiar nature of their physique, for instance, heavy manual labour or labour involving violent or frequent jerking of the body, but this is equally true of men whose occupations are also restricted by the nature of their physique. Men in general would not relish sedate types of work, for example, sewing, knitting or embroidery nor would they view with tolerance such occupations as cooking, scrubbing floors or feeding babies. With the aid of science vocational traits and abilities can be analysed and suitable plans evolved whereby women can be engaged on work for which they are suited best.

Idleness, either enforced or voluntary, as a habit is the most unsocial of all acts. It dissipates energy on a scale greater than by exertion, restricts the development of mind and body, and develops unhealthy ways of thinking and results in moral deterioration and a perverted sense or attitude towards life in general. These facts are not, however, generally recognised like many other common place things. Work on the contrary contributes to the general development of mind and body and gives man a social significance and raises his standard from the plane of animal existence. From this reasoning, one can visualise the great deterioration in the mental and physical qualities of women, brought about by this enforced idleness through centuries. A full realisation of the extent of this will only be possible when this mental and moral stupor has been removed and women allowed to progress in the same way as men unfettered and unassailed.

Side by side with this enforced idleness on the part of women and a large body of able bodied men, who cannot find work, we notice an army of workers engaged in present day industries and other walks of life composed of men,

women and children of all ages sweating and toiling without respite, with no leisure to breathe in the fresh air, degraded to the level of cattle. A state which ignores the existence of such a shameful state of affairs and disclaims responsibility for its continuation has no right to be called a state.

The decision to enforce compulsory work for every woman, as distinct from household duties, would necessitate the establishment of conditions congenial to such work and the introduction of facilities which would enable them to concentrate on the work in hand. We have not only to consider of unmarried women without encumbrances but also of married women with children of all ages, whose compulsory employment on a national scale would mean the organisation of creches for the benefit of children when the mothers are away on work. These creches for infants would wherever possible be attached to the respective establishments in which women are engaged in close proximity to such places of work if the conditions in the vicinity warrant such a scheme, in addition to village creches and ward creches. Schemes for maternity benefits and medical attention will follow the general procedure of socialist planning taking into consideration the peculiarities of the situation obtaining in the country.

The suggestion of enforcing compulsory labour for all adult women would come as rude and shocking to almost all the readers, for their next thoughts are directed to their own wives. The average individual in India regards woman as some sort of personal possession not to be exposed to public sight, to be confined within the four walls of a household, with no rights or liberties except those permitted by custom. But such an attitude is mostly due to tradition and religion and guided by selfish propensities, which along with various other types of opposition, will have to be combated, if necessary, ruthlessly. The function of the state in this respect is guided by humanitarian considerations and individual caprices cannot be the standard

to judge the desirability or undesirability of such actions.

I would be assailed in this advocacy with the question, what about family life in such a state, and will not by this act the family as an institution be superseded by collectivization and will not the regimentation of the individual be made complete? To this my answer is that family life as at present constituted is not guided by the laws of sex, psychology or society but by jealousy, superstition, selfishness and arrogance and as such deserves no continuation. The proposed measure undoubtedly sounds the knell of family life conceived under these latter considerations, but also ushers in a new family life based on reason and equity.

Cooking and the running of households cannot be considered as vocations which would need the allotment of more than one half of the population perpetually. In a planned society the people themselves would find it advantageous and hygienic to have these done with the aid of machinery under expert supervision in community kitchens which would be run, not with the incentive of profit but by the necessity of improving the standard of physique, health and well-being of the nation as a whole. This would enable the citizens in turn to have more leisure which can be utilised for cultural and emotional recreations.

We next come to the consideration of the present conception regarding marriage and morals. To-day in India marriage in general whether amongst Hindus, Muslims, or other communities, is a one sided arrangement. The woman is afforded no say either in the choice of her mate or in the annulment of an unsuccessful marriage. In most of the cases the marriage is contracted long before the girl becomes conscious of sex desires and the husband may be a boy of the same age or one as old as her grand-father. The considerations of age or physical well being are immaterial while those of religion, money, custom and tradition are regarded as insurmountable and of unquestionable authority.

If the state were to decree on its inception along with the economic emancipation of women that all marriages contracted prior to such date as automatically null and void and for continuation and recognition of such marriages all the women affected thereby would have to make fresh declarations out of their own free will, I am dead sure, that eighty five per cent of the present married women would refuse to make any such fresh declarations. The rest fifteen per cent would include sex debilitated, old and infirm women. This statement is not made off-hand, but as a result of keen observation of Indian society in general both in the villages and in the cities. From this one can gauge the success of the institution of marriage as at present existing.

I happened to attend out of mere curiosity while writing this chapter, a meeting organised by the Hindus of Calcutta in a prominent Hindu locality to protest against the proposed Bill for recognising the right of Hindu women for inheritance in the case of intestacy. Ninety eight per cent of those assembled were decrepit old Marwaris and Bengalees pot-bellied and these gentlemen were recognised as the veterans of Hindu society by the fact of their large scale accumulation of wealth, may be by speculation or otherwise. These gentlemen were mortally afraid that by this legislation all their wives, some of them perhaps, had more than one, and perhaps in age, considerably younger than themselves, would become independent of them. The frantic assembly declared, invoking all the sanctions of the scriptures that the right of women, to property or divorce, were beyond the conception of law, equity and religion. It is this decision that guides our society and legislators at present. If one were to declare at this assembly that women possessed the same rights as men in these respects with perfect to set at naught marriages at any time without ascribing cause or reason and that the state would recognise this right and implement such rights,

there would have been general heart failure and collapse. How funny such a sight would be !

It is generally argued that any proposed measure calculated to enforce the right of women to divorce and to inheritance of property in the intervening period prior to the socialist revolution would meet with unprecedented opposition as to be incapable of being enforced on a national scale. I feel this fear is unwarranted.

Marriage as such is guided by the factors of sex and psychology and has been made into an institution for the sake of convenience, primarily motivated by the sense of jealousy. The consideration of marriage would, therefore, amount to the consideration of these various factors in their elements and as composite and would be on the lines of sex, psychology and eugenics rather than religion or morality. Since sex is vital to the individual it is equally vital to the society as a whole, and as such deserves direction at the hands of the state.

The notion that women are generally monogamous by instinct and men polygamous cannot stand the test of reality. The idea is spread by men as a measure of self conciliation and in justification of the existing code of one sided morality. Independent thinking women are not disposed to admit that women are generally monogamous in their instinct, but on the contrary admit that women are as much polygamous as men if not more. Certain section of women who follow men in their idea regarding the monogamous instinct of women have to blame the moral restraint brought about by centuries of tradition, reinforced by education in the present sense of morality and their dependence on men. Religion and superstition have also their influence. Their opinion, for these reasons, cannot be regarded as rational or representative of truth. It cannot be denied that intense love or say passion often creates an obsession to exclude other objects which try to come in conflict, whether it be love for another man or woman, but

this is only momentary and not a permanent obsession. The duration may vary with individual temperaments. Passion admits no fixity in itself nor is sex urge the only urge in women. Her economic dependence on man which in itself is determined by sex need makes her pay more attention on sex, just as the typist does to typewriting, but it cannot be argued from this that the end and aim of life of the typist is typewriting. Sex at present is a job to her, in which she can be gainfully engaged in the service of man, and this affords satisfaction of her material wants in addition to sex needs. The typist feigns attachment to one job for the sake of economic security, just as a woman feigns attachment to one man to almost similar ends. This fixity in sex attachment is not by the very nature of sex but imposed by extraneous circumstances and is never out of unrestrained free will in which sex urge is the deciding factor determining sex relationship. Every husband lulls himself into the belief that his wife is solely devoted to himself but does not stoop to consider that she would show the same devotion to any other man to whom she might have been wedded to in his stead.

Marriage is a convenient arrangement whereby sex needs can be satisfied at all times without hindrance, whenever one is inclined to it. That is perhaps the only consideration in favour of marriage. It would be inconvenient to run after a member of the opposite sex when one feels the sex urge just as animals do. But simply for the sake of convenience one cannot sacrifice other considerations and make marriage a very rigid and inviolable institution.

The criterion of a happy marriage is when both the parties by urge of their sexual instinct and personal attachment to each other for the sake of convenience and emotional satisfaction enter into wedlock and remain so till that emotional attachment wears away in one or both. That is the only scientific view of marriage; other views are either absurd fancies or deliberate concoctions of partial

truths. Such a marriage can be dissolved at the will of either of the parties without ascribing cause or reason and the state is bound to recognise that dissolution. The continuation of a union which has lost the emotional urge of the contracting parties can only be done through constant mental repression, which is harmful emotionally and cannot be justified. When such an enforced continuation of the married state does not serve any moral or social purpose, I find no reason why state should give continuity for such a system which is essentially harmful. Legislation to give effect to this principle need not be delayed till the advent of the socialist revolution, for then without legislation by the very process of economic emancipation women would assert their rights and get out of the clutches of alliances which afford no psychological or emotional satisfaction. Opposition to the recognition of women's right to divorce can only come from two classes of people, one comprising of old or prematurely old individuals who are themselves wedded to young women, in which class we can include quite a number of the multimillionaires and otherwise influential people in the country, and another set comprising apologists of capitalism including a number of religious functionaries.

In the present order of society divorce would throw the responsibility of paying for the maintenance of the children and the wife till she marries for a second time on the husband. This is the only equitable and just solution, for it has been through man's guilt that women have been reduced to the level of mere chattels persona for which they should be made to pay in this generation. The present divorce laws are imperfect in the respect that the proceedings take the shape of endless litigation and in majority of the cases husbands have to resort to ascribing adultery to their wives and make ludicrous statement in the court and put both the parties to shame. Divorce if it is to be effective should be made as simple as possible and

girls early pregnancy is a grave danger. The child marriages are invariably contracted by the parents of the children under religious zeal.

Regarding the laws of marriage, divorce and women's rights the tenets of Islam are more rational and tolerant than the tenets of Hinduism, but the unfortunate feature has been that the tenets of religion wherever beneficial have been covered by the fossil of custom and tradition as to obstruct it from general appreciation. Purdah for women, though of Islamic origin purely motivated by conditions in Arabia, has invaded the realm of Hindu society adding one more curse to the bane of Hindu women. Wherever Islamic laws have been good these have not found general acceptance, but where these have been reactionary and objectionable religious bigots have willingly borrowed. A host of other disabilities which women to-day suffer would, however, vanish with the economic emancipation of women as a class, but propaganda in the meanwhile should as far as possible be applied for remedying these.

The present conception of morality in general needs a more detailed survey. By a cursory examination it would be evident that these moral theorising have been solely evolved for the purpose of justifying the subordination of women by men. Since theology went hand in hand with social organisation, theologicians have contributed largely to the formulation of moral codes. In fact, religion has been the handmaid to society in all countries without exception and all religions share the same set of views with slight modifications and different mythologies. Religious laws have been framed to fill the gap of social legislation, but since religions are essentially based on supernatural sanction these laws have also been imbued with sanctity and immutability. Hindu religion ascribes divinity in man and following this according to the Hindu Code of morals to women their husbands are gods in person devotion to whom is as much sacred and inviolable as devotion to God.

Hindustan being the treasure-house of all religious lore, almost all the religions copied the Hindu moral code though with slight modifications to fit in with their religious conceptions. At certain stages in Hindu society these moral conceptions came to be revised and unchastity which at one time used to be classed as a sin beyond redemption, lost much of its rigidity and in Hindu mythology pertaining to these periods references to unchastity on the part of Goddesses and the wives of famous Rishis are found.

Chastity as a moral principle when divorced of its religious significance amounts to the recognition of jealousy in sex relationship. This jealousy is not restricted to men alone but to women also in an equally great degree. It is not in itself a quality of sex but a product of consciousness in the development of which tradition and the classic ideas of property play a significant part. This would be clear by a more concrete example. Men in their sex relation with women other than their own wives are not obsessed with this idea of sex jealousy in the least and in fact, on such occasions are in full support of laxity in sex morality on the part of women and encourage such thoughts. But these same men are obsessed with intense sex jealousy as far as their wives are concerned, laxity on whose part is looked upon with great wrath. The same applies to married women. If jealousy formed part of sex it would not be possible for men to gain sex satisfaction out of public women, nor would this particular woman gain any satisfaction out of her illicit relations. On the contrary, such a liberal minded advocate of the 'open conspiracy' like Mr. H. G. Wells admits of an occasion when he himself was obsessed with the most violent of sex jealousy when he came to know of the marriage of his previous wife to another man which made him destroy every trace of thing associated with her including her portrait. This jealousy invariably springs not out of sex feelings but out of the idea of possession that man or woman entertains of the mate. It is the same like the

excitement of a man when another man steals his property or makes use of it without his permission, with the only difference that woman is more intimate than the inanimate property and consequently the excitement out of jealousy is more violent. To take one more example to disprove the association of jealousy with sex take the example of a Hindu or Muslim co-wife who shares her connubial bed with another individual of her own sex. If jealousy formed part of sex she would not at any cost submit to this predicament, nor would she ever gain any sex satisfaction out of such an alliance. But it is a common place thing in our society that these women get on tolerably well in such situations. Here their minds are tuned to the idea out of economic necessity or the force of tradition, with the result that the obsession of jealousy never arises.

From the above examples it would be evident that the ideas of sex jealousy and the correlated notion of chastity for women have nothing in common with sex and are purely the result of associating marriage or prolonged sex union with the idea of possession of the other party and when this conception is removed, there would be an end to these ideas. This in a country where every story, theme or play even in the blessed nineteen forties gloats on the idea of woman's chastity must mean a revolution more radical than the revolution envisaged in the economic sphere.

One of the latest theories in sex is that sex restraint is absolutely necessary for any sort of determined effort and for the progress of a nation and as a corollary to this, it is stated that the dawn of the idea of liberalism always marks the doom of a nation. To thwart this it is suggested by the same theoreticians that a general tightening of marriage laws would bring in the desired results. History, which in recent times, has been used as a handmaid in the formulation of all sorts of theories, is freely cited in support, but with all these deceptive cloaks the idea is puritanism revived in modern form. The formulators of this theory do

not take into consideration the fact that married people are more prolific in their sex relations than the most licentious of unmarried individuals. Sex act when confined to one woman religiously wedded does not thereby become an ennobling religious act, but remains a sex act pure and simple with all its implications and is in no way different from sex act committed with different women on different occasions. If this is admitted, tightening up of marriage laws or denial of the right of divorce to women would not bring in a reduction in the frequency of sex relations.

Puritanism supposes that sex act is a degrading thing just as all reference to sex is regarded as obscene, but under the same Puritanism simply because of this sex repression individuals from the church dignitary to the front rank statesman are constantly obsessed with the idea of sex and all their actions are motivated with this repression. Under this system sex becomes the only living thought and sex craving the only incentive for effort. A man who is restrained from having a full meal always thinks of food, while a normal person who is not restricted likewise, only thinks of food when he is really hungry and at other times his mind is free from all thoughts of food.

It is nothing but prejudice to suppose that the removal of these antiquated customs would result in sex licentiousness. Certain moralists at the same time, are also afraid of the incidence of venereal diseases on an unprecedented scale. These gentlemen fail to consider the fact that venereal diseases only thrive when sex is commercialised as a direct result of their puritan teaching and not when people indulge in a clean and normal sex life. Prostitution would be a relic of the past in socialism but it is to be generally expected that when this large body of social outcasts are absorbed into regular society under a socialist revolution, in the initial stages, there would be a widespread affection of this disease, but like many other evil relics of capitalism this would also be exterminated under proper medical care

and state action. This would be facilitated by the new consciousness under which sex would not be regarded as taboo and sex diseases a matter of shame to be treated in secrecy by quacks. That is definitely a new approach to the sex problem and is the only rational one which would promote the progress of society and end once for all social crimes and perversions of the present age.

Legislation to bring about the general emancipation of women and the recognition of the new conception of morality should not be delayed indefinitely, though real economic independence to women can only come as a result of a social revolution. It is a tragic sequence in the country, that, in spite of the fact there are various politicians claiming to be socialists in the legislatures, none has so far ventured to sponsor any measure on these lines and if at all there has been any such legislative Bills these have been moved by religious reformers or by the Government. These socialists including the so-called Communists are afraid to make public the sharp conflict in their ideology with the current orthodox ideas. Playing for safety or just posing to win applause from whatever quarter it comes is not an attitude in which a socialist can take pride and arguments brought in justification are mere opportunist deceptions. Such conciliatory attitude definitely proves their lack of sincerity and ideological background.

To make women conscious of their separate identity and to foster the spirit of independence it would be worth while to deprecate the tendency of women in general to be known and addressed under men's surnames with the addition of Mrs. or Miss to these. This is a virtual recognition of the fact that they are mere possessions and appendages to men and not independent individuals possessing equal rights and privileges. The best thing would be in the circumstances for women to be addressed in their own feminine names and to take pride in being addressed so instead of feeling shy or hurt over it. For the sake of

identity they can make use of their mothers' names as initial names just like men who use their fathers' names. Marriage would bring in no change in the name of women and daughters. Damayanti of Sarala would be known as Sarala Damayanti and not as Mrs. Bandoowala or Miss Bevakoof. That is the only self-respecting attitude women can adopt. The present tendency, however, may be the result either of a false notion that marriage brings in an added social standing to a woman or the desire to bask in reflected glory.

Art and art expression are the nearest to the sex instinct and in these as well the subjugation of women and the undisputed monopoly or sway which men have exercised over women's faculty for independent thinking and expression has had a detrimental influence. When I had occasion to discuss this feature with a woman art critic endowed with a keen sense of originality and independence in thought and expression, she was resentful over the progress of art under purely men's inspiration, and expressed her disgust over the feigned feminism in art and the glorification of the feminine nude by men. She confessed that the present art could only be appreciated by homo-sexual women and thereby meaning women with perverted minds instead of normal heterosexual women endowed with independent conceptions. She was bold enough to question me as to how resentful and nauseating it would be for men if the entire field of art were to be monopolized by the images of the masculine nude staring from every angle. She confessed that the few women artists followed men because they were afraid of being stigmatised by the people as immoral and unchaste if they tried to express art from the women's point of view, and being women and heterosexual in instinct all their art would show a tendency to the masculine form and development. This art would be virile and a combination and judicious blend of both men's and women's talent would produce an art which is at once masculinely

virile and femininely beautiful. Man would be superbly artistic and revealing to the delicate tone of subtlety in the presentation of the endearing feminine portrait with every line of it reflecting the deepest emotion, but when he attempts to depict man in the same shade he would be sterile and unemotional to a degree equally contrasting. On the contrary in women's hand the masculine portrait develops on intensely human lines with the same subtlety of expression and form as characterises the feminine study, for to her the whole art and its expression under such circumstances assume great emotional significance. That is the criterion to judge art and not by the present perverted standards.

CHAPTER VII.

Religion.

Religion has been the subject of study by man ever since he began to realise his inner weakness and was presented with obstacles the solution of which was beyond his means with the knowledge and experience he had acquired by then. Religion was invoked by man for two reasons, one in a genuine effort to surmount over difficulties by seeking the assistance of the supernatural and the other in his reluctance to own defeat to himself by trying to ascribe things beyond his reach or control to a divine force. Out of a combination of this plaintive and vain attitudes of the early inhabitants of the globe, religion, or more properly worship, evolved to assume an endless variety of form and significance in later stages.

The present available historical evidence is not sufficient enough to prove whether pantheism preceded polytheism or the reverse and it has to be assumed in the absence of incontrovertible fact that both these types of worship originated at not distant intervals and both existed side by side or alone at different parts of the world. As a living organism man made his appearance not at one place but at different places on the globe where conditions permitted his existence and for this reason it was not one man and one woman that appeared first but a number of the human species. Nor could it be divine revelation that prompted

these early men to think of supernatural forces or religion. More probably it could be either fear or helplessness or it could be a mixture of both or just emotional excitement like poetry for Valmiki. For that matter monotheism must have also formed an integral part of the worship at that time for, if polytheism evolved it could only be out of monotheism ; without thinking of one God, it wouldn't be possible to think of two or more. Philosophical religion and theology including organised monotheism are later forms just as pantheism of an advanced type like the Hindu pantheism which identifies mind and matter. For our purpose here religious history is immaterial, so also the concepts of various religions. We are concerned with the happiness of individuals and the organisation of society on rational lines to secure such happiness for all.

With the progress of society elementary forms of worship assumed the role of organised religion embodying a general code of moral and social behaviour. This is particularly true of India, where religion extended to the sphere of social organisation setting its own laws and regulations detailing the organisation of society on the whole. Religions in other countries, however, were mostly inspired by individuals but definitely the conditions of society existing then were at the back of all such inspirations. In this respect all the religions fulfilled definite historical purposes, not alone Islam as claimed by M. N. Roy according to whose analysis all the rest of religions are pernicious, fascist, or just psycho-pathological symptoms. To Mr. M. N. Roy such an analysis is a matter of keen political sagacity to gain popularity in his new role of forging an alternate leadership. But that is not a proper method of assessing things at their correct value.

These various religions were in a way beneficial and met the wants of the society at the time when these were originated and continued to be so for considerably long periods thereafter. These wants were at one time of the tribe, or

a community, class or set of people inhabiting one particular tract of land and at other times of nations including its governing classes and the priestly order. Certain religions were the monopoly of a few and strived for the advancement of such few privileged votaries, while others were less restricted and sufficiently broad based to claim large sections of the people spread over vast areas. Except for a few religions all the rest were more or less rigid and unadaptable to changing conditions, for most of the teachings were in the form of maxims or commandments which forbade inquiry into the origin, validity or truth of such teachings as sinful. Where religions were adaptable and did not follow rigid injunctions but were in the form of pseudo-mystical philosophies changes proved to be difficult because of tradition and the large amount of mythology which grew with the passage of time.

Of all religions, Hinduism and Islam claim the largest number of followers in India, and for this reason a detailed consideration of these two religions would be useful.

Hinduism, the oldest religion so far known to exist, has not been originated or inspired by one individual. From the very primitive forms of worship it has grown into a very powerful religion with a great deal of philosophical background. It is the only religion of its kind which allows the fullest inquiry into its teachings and offers a place for agnostics even in its fold. It is more or less a socio-philosophical concept permeating the Indian society as a whole, influenced and extended by the vast amount of philosophical literature and a wealth of mythological tradition. To an observer who has not cared to probe into its philosophy it strikes as very dogmatic and unchanging. In the history of Hinduism, Brahminism which is the only visible form to-day, is a very recent development mostly inspired by Sankaracharya with his philosophy which is more political than religious. Brahminism waged the war on original Hinduism and monopolised the field purely for political

reasons and the caste system was an effort to stem the tide of discontentment and disintegration which set in, in the social sphere. If Vivekananda were to be a Communist and lived long enough, I am pretty sure Hinduism would have become philosophical Communism retaining much of what is original in Hinduism and yet modern as the materialism of the West, or at least there would have sprung up a considerably powerful section of Hindus professing philosophical Communism. Even to-day that possibility is not distant. If India is to turn Communist, India would be Hinduistically Communist. Hinduism is a sort of national consciousness, reviving and receding, in a constant state of motion.

In recent times one has witnessed the peculiar phenomena of Hinduism being reformed on the basis of Mahatma Gandhi's philosophy and if Gandhiji is to succeed, Hinduism would become Gandhism, yet to be known and understood as Hinduism. In the same way if Moulana Abdul Kalam Azad were to shed off his foreign name and identify himself as purely Indian without looking to Mecca or Medina for his source of inspiration and substitute for it any other place, be it Kapadwanj or Secunderabad within the boundaries of India, and evolve a philosophy suited to Indian life, Abdul Kalam Azadism would be as much Hinduism as Gandhism, even though Azadism may be yet another form of Arabic philosophy. The test is the force of such philosophy and the appeal it has got for the people. In both the cases Hinduism would cast off many of its present visible symbols and evil customs and acquire a new significance and meaning for the people.

To my reasoning it seems very possible that India can turn Communist or Socialist and adopt everything modern Communism advocates including its rational philosophies regarding sex and womanhood and yet remain Hindu or Islamic to the consolation of its broad mass of people. It all depends on how one approaches the problem, whether

with a destructive mind or constructive one. In recent history we have noticed Turkey turning as modern as Germany casting aside all the dead weight of outmoded Arab customs and still Turkey to-day is to all eyes Islamic and very much so to Indian Muslims. To cite one more concrete example, England with all her reformatations, her characteristics and ways of life is as much Christian as fascist Italy, Germany or Spain.

It is not the concept of Hinduism that stands in our way but the visible manifestations of out-worn tradition, degrading social customs and uncouth manners. Without contesting religion every one of these can be remedied by corrective measures, either through legislation or education. Communists have followed Marx's teaching that religion is the dope administered by the Capitalist society on the masses and therefore needs destruction. I fully agree with Marx in the pernicious effect of present day religions on society and social progress, and no one would be more happy than myself to see the end of all religions and religious worship. But our approach should be different. In saying that religion is the dope administered on society, one is attributing intentions or motives on the part of those who originated these religions. None of the religions were evolved with such evil intentions, instead these were evolved essentially as humanitarian measures to meet social needs, to supply a set of civic and moral laws to regulate social intercourse. No one would deny that Capitalism at a certain stage in the development of society was beneficial to it in the sense it accelerated progress, but for this reason, one cannot justify its continuation to-day under different social conditions. Who knows, the present militant Communism would also serve its purpose and give place to a new order! Every break from tradition, however, is accomplished with violence, and in Marx's own words "Force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new," but its use must be with studied care.

Should we in our attempt to establish a new society wage war against all existing religions, is a question that would naturally arise. To me it seems that thereby we would be only making our task more difficult and creating opposition where we could have gone with lesser. We are not concerned with the paraphernalia of religion and the visible symbols of religious beliefs but with the religious laws and the restrictions these place on social progress. The people are more concerned with these paraphernalias, external or visible symptoms, and their opposition would be more concerted if we attempt a frontal attack on these or engage in anti-god campaigns as in Russia. In India, the villagers are attached to these more than anywhere else, Ram Bhaiya or Krishnamachari is attached to the tuft at the back of his head and the sacred thread on his body and the temple, and to him it is of less concern whether there is a law prohibiting child marriage or affording equality of opportunity to women and untouchables. These latter things are to him laws of the Government which he would obey without hesitation, if the law is enforced. When the law is promulgated or is on the legislative anvil the opposition would be not from these villagers who are consciously religious, but from the large body of educated communalists, the political pariahs who seek refuge in religion for the furtherance of their ambitions and who for the most part, on closer scrutiny, are the most irreligious. These so-called religious or communal leaders have their cloak of religion, sacred thread or fez cap as the case may be, to hoodwink the lay masses and if we can deal with them sternly our purpose is accomplished.

The visible symptoms of religion without being attacked would die away of their own accord, when education spreads and people are brought more and more in contact with present day realities. To a casual observer, it would be evident that only the elders are obsessed with these, while the younger generation have discarded since long or

are rapidly discarding symbolic religion from their lives. If we accelerate this tendency we would be reaching our goal easily. The old fossils cannot be of lasting influence on the society and with the initial task of dislodging them from places of political and economic power, the future progress of society can be assured. Through the organisation of the youth movement and a progressive economic system the younger generation can be saved from falling prey to the propaganda of organised religion.

There is a large body of liberal opinion supported by some of the most ardent congressmen who hold that the state should not embark on social legislation, if such proposed measures are likely to wound religious feelings or affect religious customs. These gentlemen are meek witnesses when the British Government introduces any such measures and willingly acquiesce in the formulation of these, but if the suggestion for such a measure were to come from a younger or more progressive set of thinkers or politicians, they would oppose it tooth and nail, of course, by word of mouth or the written statement beyond which their opposition can never go.

Of the obnoxious features of present day Hinduism the treatment meted out to women and to the untouchables need the strongest condemnation. For the removal of these two blots from society we need not wait for a social revolution, for, after all, the social revolution would accomplish these tasks without legislative enactment. In the interim period only we can by legislation bring these reforms on the same lines as those prohibiting Sati and child-marriage initiated by the present Government. The whole lot of Congress activity have been, one of shouting the slogan of independence and of its leaders' experiments in metaphysics, press propaganda and striving after international recognition by going to Chunking, Spain and Vladivostock in the intervals out of jail life. The Congress is afraid of creating opposition from the orthodox side.

Gandhiji himself is rational and sensible, but he is driven to all these pseudo-religious steps to carry conviction in the minds of his lieutenants, the illiterate villagers and the orthodox capitalist supporters. Instead of indulging in press conferences to give vent to one's feelings of vanity and to gain self satisfaction out of gloating over fine sentiments of internationalism and world order, by a clever application of propaganda alone these measures could have been easily passed into law without much opposition. Two sets of propaganda could be very useful in addition to the official Congress propaganda based on political and humanitarian lines. In this a particular set of Muslim spokesmen's condemnation of Hinduism would be exaggerated upon and presented incessantly to the public eye and at the same time the Communalists would be slowly worked to an excited pitch in which they themselves would take the responsibility to reform Hinduism to meet the challenge of the new age. We are concerned with the result and if we can make use of our opponents' strength to bring his own downfall by a clever manipulation of movements, so much the better. To cite a concrete example, one can see the tendency of reactionary Muslim politicians themselves sponsoring the movement for the abolition of the veil for Muslim women, which they would never have done out of progressive outlook or humanitarian considerations, and these worthies have been brought to this level by the challenge of the Hindu Communalists in no way more progressive than themselves.

Even in our present day society the brake of religion on social progress can be effectively removed by such legislative measures and propaganda tactics which would confuse the minds of these Communalists themselves and prompt them to act differently from what their self interests dictate. These gentlemen would be satisfied with the external symbols of religion to vie with one another and in this we can allow them more freedom than what they them-

selves desire, for we can be definitely certain that with the progress of education and rise in the standard of living the masses themselves would discard this outer coating of religion and take to rational living. It is economic uncertainty that drives men to religion these days and if the rigours of that could be mitigated they would find less cause to invoke the assistance of super-natural powers. In the same way in critical periods of illness if competent medical advice would be readily available to save life, the villagers would invoke the aid of such sure means rather than offer sweetmeats and fruits to the temple Goddess.

As far as Mahomedanism is concerned, the task is beset with greater difficulties. Steeped in ignorance and fanatical in their faith which allows little or no reform from what the Prophet ordained, the Muslim masses are a problem by themselves, headed by virulent Communalist leaders whose claims for leadership have been gained out of unbridled exercise of impolite invectives against people of other communities. In a purely Islamic country it would have been possible and easy enough to reform the society out of Nationalist appeal but in India it is not possible for the simple reason that Muslims by their faith do not look to India as their spiritual homeland as the rest of other communities. An average Muslim feels that his mother country is elsewhere, somewhere in Arabia, Turkey or Afghanistan and his interests inalienably bound with the nationals of those countries and his existence or presence here is only to meet the needs of life as a matter of occupation. This sentiment of placing the spiritual home outside the borders of India, a feature peculiar to the Indian Muslims like the Sudetan Germans, has been of incalculable harm to Muslims themselves, who are children of the soil just as much as the Hindus. This tendency has been reinforced by the sinister Aryan racial theory which supposes that the original inhabitants of India were an inferior set of people and everything desirable in India have been inspired by foreigners

and to be a real Indian is something derogatory. Hindus as well as Muslims have been carried away by this unscientific conception and majority of them feel with considerable vanity that they are hybrids or half castes and trace their origin to Persia or Iran. For this reason, quite a number of Muslims in India feel that they have Arab, Turkish or Persian blood though they may be only Hindu converts, born of purely Indian parents, with no blood ties with these foreigners. To be a half-caste has been made a glorious virtue in this country, while Muslims in other countries, though admitting their religion to be of Arabian origin, do not admit of Arabian blood in their veins and only take pride in being known and identified as nationals of the countries in which they are born and to which they belong. The Indian Muslim regards everything Indian as un-Islamic and everything Persian, Arabian or Turkish as Islamic and highly venerable, however such things may appear otherwise, to an impartial mind. He translates his feeling of the absence of a real home in which he can take pride and in the building of which he can feel noble, into his actions, manners and customs. Factually speaking ninety eight per cent of the Muslim masses of India have no Arabian, Turkish or Persian blood in them, but yet there are Muslims who would take it as an offence to be called pure blooded Indians and take pride in being called as half castes. A pure Turk, in spite of being a Mussalman, detests to be classed as an Arab, and dislikes the imposition of Arabian customs on him, ever since he began to realise his national glory and the true greatness of his country and its blood. A Chinese Muslim shares the same feeling and his attachment is to China and not to Central Asia or Arabia. Persian conquerors who happened to be Muslims married into the families of their vassals and street girls and their progeny in India, by reason of their wealth brought about by such alliances have come to dominate Muslim life and lead Muslim opinion. These scapegoats to save their own

skin have spread this idea of glorifying the half-caste, dragging the highly tolerant and revolutionary religion of Islam and its noble precepts to the mire. Can you compare these Shibboleths and the dogmatism they have spread in this country with the Islam which gave birth to thinkers like Averroes and Avicena ?

Without a re-orientation in the attitude of the Muslims in India neither the progress of India as a whole nor of the Muslim masses would be possible. Towards this the first essential is the substitution of the present pernicious and ill-founded racial theory and the racial psychology engendered thereby by a truly national and self respectful racial theory supported by incontrovertible historical evidence. A closer examination of such a racial theory is attempted in another chapter which would enable Indians composed of both Hindus and Muslims to understand their real self and feel the greatness of their heritage. The perpetuation of the present attitude would never bring in any social advance of the Muslims as a community, instead under the bigoted leadership, more and more of unwanted and out-of-date Persian, Arabic and Turkish customs and institutions dug out from the relics of the past, which the modern day Turks, Persians and Arabs have themselves discarded, would be transplanted here and foisted on the masses in the name of true Islamic culture and symbolic of the era of regeneration and independence of Islam. The gullible masses would fall prey to the degrading influence of such antiquated ways of thinking and living on account of the highly passionate communal propaganda tainted with fanatical hatred of everything Indian. On the contrary, the Muslims will have to be re-educated on more rational and self-respecting lines to engender the feeling that to be a truly self-respecting Indian is fully commensurate with the tradition and teaching of Islam, and instead it is essentially un-Islamic to entertain the idea that they are half-castes. We have taken to various beliefs but that can-

not make us leave our solid cultural moorings which are wedded to the soil just as our very existence are dependent on the prosperity of this land. Lack of appreciation of our cultural heritage and the inability to locate our real moorings only make us hunt after and take pride in reflected glory and concoct racial connections of doubtful veracity. We have to-day people in our midst who in their overzealousness carry the assimilation of ideas to its illogical sequence by trying to transplant institutions and customs peculiar to the land of origin or places in which the idea thrived most into our midst stock and barrel without for a moment stopping to think whether such customs or manners have the remotest connection or bearing on these ideas, which they are trying to adopt. If in the name of tolerance we could allow so many religious beliefs to spread in the country on the same principles of tolerance we should be allowed to fight the tirade against Indianism that is being carried on in the name of Islam both within the borders of India and outside, by developing a still more virile Indianism than hitherto witnessed in our history.

Criticism of Islamic rites and customs, however objectionable these may be, has been made a risky and dangerous job in India. A modification of Hitler's shock troop tactics, called communal riot is the direct answer to such criticism however well intentioned and impartial it may be irrespective of the fact whether it is made by Hindus or Muslims. Criticism by Hindus would ignite the whole gun powder granary of communal hatred while Muslim criticism of Hindu customs and manners in the most vulgar manner does not amount to the same thing. Christian criticism also is not so resented by the Muslims as criticism by the Hindus. Amity between these two people may have existed for considerably long stretches of time, but the fact still remains that a solid fusion of these two Communities is not within sight. India being predominantly Hindu and for that reason any Government of India would be predom-

inantly manned by Hindus, legislative measures sponsored with the purpose of reforming Muslim society or institutions would always be taken as aggrandisement by the Hindus and violently opposed by the Muslims as a communal measure. If out of date Turkish, Arabian and Persian customs continue to act as a dead weight on the shoulders of the Muslim masses of India, the fanaticism of the people and the leaders have only to be blamed. Even an all-party Government, however powerfully constituted would fail to achieve this result, for such Governments cannot exclude Hindus altogether. Reformation of Islam and progress of the Muslims must therefore remain a task for self respecting and progressive Muslims in the Community.

To surmise the attitude of our future state to religions as a whole should be one of strict vigilance over the activities of religious leaders to ensure that these people do not become the tools for counter-revolutionary activities, and as regards religious observances, unconcern, so long as these do not obstruct the progress of society. The social relations of the people would be guided by political ideology and religious laws in these respects would be superseded by state laws. The state should also ensure conditions favourable for the fusion of all religions into one by removing restrictions regarding inter-marriage between various religionists and encourage such measures openly. No public religious propaganda or demonstrations would be allowed and religion would be a strictly personal and private affair. Education should be so reformed as to draw the younger generation away from the fetters of religion and new conversions should be prohibited. Marriage and divorce regulations would be the subjects of state enactments and not the concern of religions. Religious endowments would be administered by the Nationalities Council or other suitable body to be set up for the purpose, so also the maintenance of all existing places of worship, mosques, temples, churches, etc. So long as these do not obstruct

the progress of society their existence and worship at such places would continue as hitherto. Blasphemy would not be considered an offence, provided living individuals are not subject to abuse thereby. The state would be opposed not to the idea of belief in one God or many Gods but the abuse of such beliefs to regulate human life and social relations by the promulgations of commandments, Smrities, and the like opposed to what seems to be rational and beneficial to society as a whole and the state regulations and political ideology existing at the time. Incitement of communal jealousies or rival communal propaganda would be regarded as criminal offences and new basis should be found to bring the various communities on a common platform and occasions to fraternise with each other like Harvest festivals, National days and commemoration of great events. Resort to severe repressive measures, anti-god campaigns, confiscation of religious properties and ridicule of religious heads, disfranchisement of members of religious groups and taxation of religious endowments as done in Russia by the Communists would not be necessary if the people are afforded the opportunity to educate themselves on rational and scientific lines. The production of films glorifying the lives of saints and miracle mongers have to be greatly deprecated even now and it is fit to impose a rigorous censorship on such rather than on kissing in the films. It would be worth while to discourage use of religious, communal and caste surnames and to encourage the use of names which do not have any such significances. The greatest guarantee against the oppressive features of religion would be afforded by the general economic emancipation of the people and the exclusion of religious laws from the domain of social relations. If religious worship and faith afford satisfaction for a large section of the people, let them have these, for after all it is our task to assure the maximum of happiness to the maximum number of people and not the success of one schism or the other.

CHAPTER VIII.

Language.

If the substance of democracy is to be assured for India we need seriously think of evolving a common national language for the country. Various suggestions have so far been made in this respect but the real solution has yet to be found. If any language has claims to be the national language, then Hindi, Hindustani or Urdu is the most suited to take this place by reason of mere numerical strength of people already using this language, its variations and allied tongues. But here again controversy makes decision difficult.

In elementary form, Hindi, Hindustani and Urdu are indistinguishable from one another, all the three words representing one and the same language, originated in the plains of Northern India where foreigners settled after conquering the whole of the northern tracts. In those times in Northern India political and economic degradation of the people were so complete that they lost all cultural moorings and facilities for development of their ancient languages with the result that they succumbed to foreign influence very greatly. All the languages of North India underwent great changes absorbing large number of foreign words and in this process evolved the dialect which was the forerunner of present day Hindi, Hindustani or Urdu. Half Indian, half Persian, jumbled together in the characteristic fashion of soldiers and bazaarmen this dialect became in sub-

sequent eras the khady boli or the standing speech of the provinces in and around the Moghul capital of India. The language suited the purposes of conversation alright, simple and commonplace, but when it came to the question of literature, it was wholly inadequate to be expressive. Muslims and those amongst the Hindus who courted Persian patronage and culture while writing in this new dialect borrowed extensively from Persian and the language they evolved in that process with a greater Persian and Arabic content came to be known as Urdu. Those Hindus who wanted to revive the link with the past began increasingly borrowing from Sanskrit, the common cultural language of ancient India and their language with a greater leaning to Sanskrit came to be known as Hindi.

When the question of a national language agitated the public mind, the Indian National Congress to strike a happy medium between the two variations of Hindi and Urdu put the nomenclature Hindustani for the original dialect which was midway between the two. Hindi writers in putting the language into proper shape relied on Sanskrit grammar just as Urdu writers leaned to Persian and Arabic, but the attempts of both have not been very satisfactory. With the advent of the talking pictures and the popularity given to Hindustani, it is certain that one form of this language will ultimately become more widespread in use in the country and serve the purpose of inter-provincial speech. The provincial languages will continue to serve the local needs and unless drastic changes occur immediately, English would continue for a long time to come to be the major cultural, literary or national language of the country just as the Anglo-Indian civilization of to-day has replaced the purely Indian and the Indo-Persian civilizations of the past. It is not a deplorable thing any way, we have become thereby aware of the progress around us and cultivated the yearning to go forward. Could we not have done that even without English is a question which need not be

answered. We can not go back on history, but can definitely shape the future.

None of our present-day languages, including Hindi or Urdu can meet our needs fully. These languages have to be vitalized to meet the requirements of current science and literature and this can only be done by borrowing from modern European languages, or by coining new words to express delicate shades of meaning and new concepts. For this purpose if we go back to Sanskrit or Persian that would make the languages more archaic than living and real. Let us move with the times and take care of the present and that process would help us to build for the future.

In the development of Hindi, Hindustani or Urdu there is yet another possibility. We can water down the Hindustani to meet the local needs of various provinces by borrowing from our provincial languages and rounding off the characteristic Hindi sounds to meet such needs. In this manner the language will grow in myriad forms to form dialects with different complexes and ultimately a conglomerated speech which would be a multi-faced variant of the present day Hindi, Hindustani or Urdu. This would possibly envelope the country as a common medium of speech with a simple grammar. Perhaps this would be the "Indian" of the future Republic of India, the national language of the people with a large number of Persian, English, Sanskrit, Tamil, Bengalee and Malayalam words, elastic and vigorous. This is very likely if South Indian, Bengali, Marathi and Gujarati writers begin to attempt literary compositions in Hindustani. They have got the genius and that literary bent which is so essential to influence the shape of a new language than the present day Hindi or Urdu speaking people. This would shock most of our puritans and scholars, but instead of arguing I would request them to read the old testament and to-day's English daily newspaper, read the Rigveda and the post-

Panini Sanskrit texts if they know Sanskrit, or a book composed in their own language one hundred and fifty years ago, if there be any in prose or poetry and those published to-day and then try to compare. Languages are not immutable things, they change just as easily as men's customs, manners or modes of living. Languages are not divine ordinances, these are created by men and must take shape and change to suit the needs of men.

We in India made a similar attempt at one stage in our civilization to evolve a common cultural language for the purposes of literature and inter-provincial contact. The result was Sanskrit, the refined language, refined out of the provincial prakrits of those times, and that language in spite of its involved grammar and intricate construction endured for a long while and still continue to be so to a limited extent. Literary compositions, probably, were attempted in this language for the first time, or may be, others were of lesser significance and, therefore, did not endure, but in any case this Esperanto of the Hindus of old influenced almost every other language of India and the world. A synthetic product of the spoken dialects of India, in the shaping of this language, the monosyllabic Chinese, ancient Persian, Greek and Latin supplied inspiration and few choice words. But Philologists, Racial Pandits I should call them, have assigned different sources to this language and have termed it an Aryan monopoly. The Indian support to this bunkum comes from the North of India, by a mistaken conception of the North Indians themselves in an effort to save their skins. European philologists support the theory, because thereby they have the idle satisfaction that Indians or the coloured people were not their fore-runners in matters of culture and civilization, though in fact they were. To-day they find one other reason to support the theory and that is, if worked out well it can help to divide North Indians from South Indians and sow disunity in the soil. Since political tutelage by foreigners

extended throughout the North and the cultural degradation became so complete thereby, Persian, the official court language influenced and replaced most of the old languages of North India with the result that the present day Hindi, Bengali, Urdu, Marathi, Gujarati, Punjabi, Sindhi, etc. have gained a common bond and a complexion all by themselves and different from the languages of the South which have retained much of their ancient purity and Indian character. The languages of North India are hybrid forms to-day with Persian contents varying from forty to sixty per cent. of the total vocabularies in each case. This cultural subordination, people to-day mistake to be as the result of racial admixture.

To make the fact more plain to you, let us take our present civilization which is purely Anglo-Indian in character in the matter of dress, ways of speech, customs, manner and modes of thinking, but can you for ever think or say that this is the result of racial admixture and thereby attribute a European ancestry to the present day Indians? How few of us are Anglo-Indians by race in India? That was the same case with our ancestors in their relationship with Persians. From this you cannot adduce that bulk of the population have become Anglo-Indians, Indo-Persians, Indo-Iranians, or Aryans as termed by the Philologists. We may have Anglo-Indian customs, manners or civilization and Indo-Persian speeches but as a people or as a race we are Indians and as a nation one. An Indian who is a racial entity by himself to the entire world is to-day an Aryan or a Dravidian or an Arab cum Persian religiously racial entity within the borders of his own ancestral country and that seems to be a pretty ridiculous idea. Many of us have become Christians or Muslims by faith and since these religions are of European or Arab origin we haven't thereby become Europeans or Arabs and simply because some of us have Anglo-Indian or Indo-Persian speeches, we, all, of us, haven't become half-castes thereby. Any Indian who

claims himself to be an Aryan by race to-day (in the Philologists' and Ethnologists' sense of the word) is admitting unwittingly that his great grandmother was one amongst those sweeper girls who succumbed to the foreigners.

Arya the Sanskrit word and the word Dravida are not ethnological terms and have, therefore nothing to do with race, one meaning learned or worthy and the other the name of a region in the south. I have attempted to cover this problem and spot the ravaging effects of these ethnological theories and the means to counteract them in a subsequent chapter and also in another book " BHASHA " published by the Record Publishing Co., Calcutta.

The annihilation of this racial doctrine will greatly facilitate the spreading of Hindi in South India and in Bengal and to make Hindi a national language these are the regions where it should be spread. To facilitate this and to bring the various Provinces of India nearer and to encourage inter-provincial understanding we would find it absolutely necessary to have a common script for all our Indian languages. If we do not attempt such a unification we would be unnecessarily hampering the educational progress of India. The simple fact that we cannot do away with English for our High School and University Classes would necessitate the child of future India from one of the Provinces to learn three Scripts in his school career, one of his own mother tongue, another of Hindi, Hindustani or Urdu the National language and the third of English. Can we not do all these with just one script, is what every sensible man would be prompted to ask. A universal script adapted to the needs of India would be the only solution to India's language problem. With appalling poverty around us and lack of adequate finances for any large scale educational programme we should look around to save on energy, equipment, time and money in our effort to make four hundred million people literate and aware of the current world they are living in. Just making

them literate will not be enough, in fact it would be useless if we can not provide them with cheap books, newspapers and periodicals to help them pursue their education for life. Otherwise they would just learn in their school age and then forget everything they learned when they reach manhood or womanhood and that would be still worse. We will have wasted money and energy for no benefit either for themselves or the nation as a whole. And when the question of providing cheap books, periodicals and newspapers comes, the numerous scripts of India, none of them suited to modern methods of printing, typewriting or duplicating are insuperable barriers.

Chinese people can claim to be the originators of the art of printing, but they could not benefit appreciably by the invention for the reason that the script of their language was not so well adapted as the Roman to this new device. Sentimental opposition stood in the way of revising the script with the result that China lagged behind in the matter of literacy, while Europe in the course of a few centuries could wipe out illiteracy entirely. In Russia the movement for replacing the out of date scripts with the Roman began well under the first wave of Communist regime, but Stalin in an effort to shut Russia out from the rest of the world and the world from Russia and the happenings inside the country re-introduced the Russian script for all those languages. But to-day with Stalin's power fully established within Russia and his personal ambition growing for world domination, it is likely, that this clever barrier would be lifted once for all, to help the export of her culture and new civilization abroad. And for this Roman would be the most suited vehicle, for it is already the universal script in the sense that four out of the six continents of the world use it exclusively, while its use is very widespread in the rest two than any other script.

Though her present leaders are opposed to any idea of drastic script reform, India of all countries has witnessed

an endless series of script changes for her languages in the past centuries. In that respect we can be proud, and we have shown in all ages, our awareness to progress around and our capacity for adaptation. From the ancient Kharoshthi script written from right to left like Arabic, we changed to the Brahmi written from left to right like any of the present day scripts, when we progressed from carving and chiselling figures on rocks and other hard surfaces for our writings to writing on palm leaves, berch bark, thin cloth and paper with pointed iron rods, pens and pencils. Holding the chisel in the left hand and hammering with the right, the most convenient mode of engraving was from right to left and this influenced the earliest of our scripts. Brahmi, the reformed script also underwent great changes, Nagari, Nandi Nagari, Vengi, Chalukya, North and South Asoka, Vattezhuthu, and a host of other scripts followed in the wake of Brahmi for our various languages. However present day Indians do not show the same enthusiasm and awareness as their great grandfathers in the matter of this essentially useful reform though they have adapted themselves to Persian, Arab, and English customs, Institutions, speech, dress, mode of living, eating, manners, etc. for the simple reason that the greatest of India's leaders think of marching backward than forward enamoured by the glory of the mythical past.

Gandhiji acquiesces in the existence side by side of the Nagari and Arabic scripts to which Jawaharlal lends support with an added suggestion of a common script for the entire North adapted from Nagari and another common script for the entire South, while the Muslim League would be satisfied with nothing less than Arabic for Pakistan and the Hindu Mahasabhaites are all out for Devanagari. These opinions are held in spite of the fact that Nagari and Arabic are both cumbersome for printing and typewriting, in the case of one, six to seven hundred characters are needed while for the other the script is so formed that hitherto

printing had to be done from blocks and lithographic stones prepared from handwritten material. Looking through these suggestions I have often wondered what respective remedies our political leaders would recommend for tropical malaria ! In one case it could be water from the Ganges and in the other desert sand from Arabia.

To gauge the depth of opposition, to invite useful suggestions and to do pioneering work in the adaptation of the Roman script to all Indian languages, both North Indian, South Indian and Urdu, the author has formed an All India Organisation called the Bhasha Samithi. From the initial success of the organisation and press reviews I have come to the conclusion that all sensible people are keenly enthusiastic about the reform and the Samithi has been encouraged to issue Primers and Text Books in various Indian languages printed in Roman. To meet the requirements of Indian languages and to simplify the phonetics for the child, new phonetic values have been ascribed to the different characters of the Roman alphabet on the same lines as those of our present day languages, for example, ' h ' would be pronounced ' ha ' instead of ' echh ' and ' k ' would be pronounced as ' ka ' instead of ' ke ' etc. As a result of suggestions received from various quarters a common basic alphabet of 34 characters have been agreed upon tentatively for all Indian languages making use of 22 characters from the present English Alphabet and adding dots or macrons to five vowels to represent the longer sounds and diacritical marks to seven consonants to meet the requirements of the finer phonetic distinctions characteristic of Indian languages. Only lower case characters are recommended for the sake of simplicity in writing, learning and printing. 34 characters in the place of 52 now in use for Roman (including Capital and small letters) must mean an enormous saving in the equipment for a printing press and would also save a lot of composing time while in the case of typewriters this must result in more

rapid work and ease in operation.

The great advantage of such a reform would be that Indians of one Province can read books printed in the language of another Province quite easily and naturally and the switch over in the high school stages from Indian languages to English would be extremely simple. This would help migration of students from one University to another frequently, a condition so vital and necessary in the evolution of a pan-Indian culture which can only be influenced by youths trained in more than one University and who have therefore an insight into the elements constituting Indian culture on the whole. Knowledge of languages other than one's own would help in wiping out provincial jealousies and bickerings. This would also help the growth of newspapers and periodicals through technical improvement and also pave the way for removing adult illiteracy. The adopted form of Roman has been named Bhasha Lipi to counteract sentimental opposition and there is nothing inappropriate in this since the same script when used for English is called the English script and when used for German the German script. We have the same claims to this script as Englishmen or Frenchmen and I am pretty confident that with some effort we can bring in this much needed reform in the course of the next few years for all Indian languages.

CHAPTER IX.

Race and Racial Psychology.

A scientific study of race and racial psychology has not been attempted so far in the so-called democratic countries for the simple reason that liberal thinkers have found it convenient to dismiss the whole thing as irrational. An impartial study of internal politics of different countries and world politics in general reveals that this irrational thing plays a more decisive part in the shaping of things than the purely economic, and where the economic pull tries to assert itself in the general trend of events this irrational pull deviates the current of economic history over short range of time at least, if not for long. Liberal thinkers and Communist theoreticians have not paid attention to this purposefully, I should believe. The first category of persons have always been apologists of the existing order of things with occasional indulgence in slight touches of revolutionary thought to give colour to their ideas and to them acceptance of the theory of racial psychology presents a dreadful perspective of a new alignment of world forces based on racial psychology not quite too helpful for their present complacent attitude towards life. Communists on the other hand are afraid to admit the influence of race and racial psychology for the reason that this would undermine their theory of unity of world proletariat and world revolution fostered by the united

action of this proletariat.

Admitting the fact that in the longer vision of history, economic forces play a decisive role in the shaping of events, one cannot lightly brush aside features which are definitely powerful in the shaping of events currently and for a great number of years still to come. In this analysis I am concerned more with to-day, tomorrow and day after than a century hence and for this reason, an important factor which affects our progress to-day deserves the fullest attention.

Racial classification has proceeded on the lines of physical characteristics of people with comparative philology playing second fiddle. Racial psychology is difficult to define like the concept of Nationalism both having many things in common. But roughly it can be said as one great prejudice grown out of the early clan or tribal feelings, which itself when analysed would be found to spring out of the idea of family and the conception of morality guiding its relations. At one time discussing with Askari Ali Khan Majazi, a thinker and writer in the Urdu language, who was at that time working on a Book on Racial Psychology in that language, I was disposed to ridicule his idea, but since then my observations have made it clear to me that some sort of racial psychology plays a definite part in the shaping of national events. For example, to-day the world is divided into two great racial divisions roughly known as the Whites and the Blacks and nationally represented as Europeans and Asiatics. Nobody would deny the characteristically distinct psychologies of these two divisions of humanity and the effect of such distinction in the shaping of world politics. These two great racial divisions have however various sub-divisions mostly based on the concepts of Nationalism and certain other facial and physical characteristics and linguistic affinities. Just as in the case of Nationalism, the effect of the existence of this racial feeling, I would prefer to call it Racialism on the same lines

as Nationalism, has been more pernicious than constructive, but one must consider that such destructive forces are also at times widely acknowledged as being beneficial and acted upon. For example if Nationalism were to be generally believed as pernicious what would amount to Patriotism and the glory attached to patriotic acts!

More often forces which are to all purposes destructive can be made use of for constructive purposes, like violence, wars, revolutions, etc. but it all depends on the way in which these forces are harnessed and made use of. My approach to the whole conception of Racialism is on these lines. Nationalism helps to create unity where diversity prevails, makes people tighten their belts and pull at one stretch, sometimes to their great benefit, and generally acts as a tonic when utilised properly. Strychnine is a good heart tonic but is a virulent poison as well.

The most pernicious of all racial theories propounded so far as India is concerned, is the one concerned with the division of the great Indian race, a race to every standard is one and distinct from the rest, into two, as Aryan and Dravidian. This theory like many others calculated to divide India and help its foreign rulers retain their hold on the country has been originated by Englishmen, and in recent times, got its impetus from German scholars under the influence of National Socialism. By this theory it is claimed that the source of all culture is Aryan, a race superior to the rest originated somewhere in Central Asia or Eastern Europe and who migrated to India and Central Europe (to be precise Germany) carrying with them the germs of world civilization. The European origin of the word Aryan is traced to the Latin word *Arianus*, belonging to *Ariana* or *Aria* (Greek *Arceia*) the East part of ancient Persia and in old Persian to a word *Ar* meaning plough, and for the simple reason that a word *Arya* is found in Sanskrit, though possessing an entirely different meaning with no traces of similarity meaning *Sreshtha*,

learned or high ranked, it has been easy enough for these scholars to say that Sanskrit came to India along with these Aryans. Comparative philology, as pointed out earlier, was brought to the assistance of this theory; certain similarities in the Sanskrit and German grammars, existence of similar sounds in Sanskrit, Persian and German languages supplied all the necessary evidence to conclusively establish the claims. In addition old archæological relics dug out indiscriminately with inscriptions of questionable antiquity deciphered to suit the purpose, established beyond doubt this wonderful race theory pertaining to a super race called Aryans. The protagonists of this theory, if they happened to be Europeans, jumped to Sanskrit, and one must consider that to European audience the words Sanskrit and Hindu have very exotic and mystic touch capable of being used as magic even, to draw similarities and conclusions. If such resemblances between one language and another can be enough proof for tracing identical racial origins, which two languages in the world can be said to have no such resemblances or identical sounds? For example, in Singhalese, a language spoken in Ceylon more than a thousand words can be traced to Portuguese and adopting the same argument if one were to assert that Singhalese people are of Portuguese racial stock how ridiculous it would sound though such a theory would incite the vanity of some of the Singhalese people who would be more happy to claim a European ancestry than an Indian one.

To European scholars due to the exotic nature of India and the far East, scrappy bits of learning in some of the Indian languages, Archaeology and Philosophy of the Hindus and the Egyptians have been very helpful to merit recognition in their lands, (like our own mania to glorify mediocres from our midst for the qualification of being London returned or trained) with the result one can find today even in the learned periodicals prints of Rama and Sita

classified as Egyptian paintings and the names of Abdul and Salim as Hindu names. Yet in the face of such absurd findings the perpetrators are regarded as authorities on everything Indian and oriental, greater than the greatest of Indians, and are the recipients of knighthoods and academical awards for researches on Indian subjects. These authorities, though very reluctant to admit the existence of a purely Indian civilization independent of European impact or origin have post dated the antiquity of Sanskrit literature to suit their own theories.

In the matter of facial characteristics points of resemblance are adduced from the Persian features of some of the hybrid populations of the north. These people, to any man of average intelligence and capacity for observation would be evident, are the mixed progeny of the middle ages born out of Indian women in Moghul Harems and to Persian dancing girls of Indian noblemen and vassals like the various other hybrid populations we now come across in the country. In a study of Racialism the presence of a large number of Anglo-Indians in India would not be enough foundation to prove that Indians in general are of English racial stock, while the basic population of the country have entirely different origins and racial characteristics. Self respecting Indians have contested this theory ever since the pernicious doctrine was set afoot, but the support to the theory has come also from some Indian professors. The zeal of such persons to trace foreign heredity is just natural, for if you ask an Anglo-Indian to ninety per cent certain he would say the name of an English village as his ancestral home, though not a single Englishman would be found existent to claim the fathership of this Indian descendent.

The consummate unity provided by religion has been a serious deterrent to the popular acceptance of this racial doctrine to the discomfiture of its protagonists until lately. But to-day the pernicious effects of the doctrine are becoming more and more evident with sectional feuds and petty

jealousies taking the forefront in political matters. One can see erstwhile Communists like M. N. Roy declaring that Punjabis are so distinct from Madrasis that there would be no salvation for Madrasis without a Dravidistan and Mr. M. A. Jinnah has referred to the idea of a Dravidistan along with Pakistan. The South Indians who had produced some of the greatest Acharyas and exponents of Hindu religious thought at a time, when the unity of Hinduism was seriously threatened and who even to-day are responsible mainly for the upkeep of the various Hindu religious temples and centres of learning from Himalayas to Kanya Kumari, are by this theory excluded from claiming a common heredity with the North Indians. As a result South Indians generally are being looked down upon in the North as having nothing in common with the northerners, as separate nationals and everything Dravidian as detestable and distinct from the nobler Aryan. North Indian Universities go to the extent of providing chairs for the study of Persian, Arabic and a host of other foreign languages, while Tamil and its sister languages like Kanarese, Telugu and Malayalam which are nearer and which afford a more direct clue to the ancient civilization of India, rather than these foreign languages are scrupulously avoided. An average North Indian regards Persian and allied tongues as peculiarly fascinating and beautiful and shows a tendency to borrow from these languages and claim ancestry from there, while he dismisses everything Tamilian or South Indian in an off-hand manner. How many of the North Indians try to see at least for once, a South Indian picture when exhibited in the North and compare this attitude on the part of the North Indians with the popularity of Hindi pictures in the South. If a Tamilian can appreciate Hindi it is equally possible for a Hindi speaking man at least to try to appreciate Tamil.

This tendency, however, on closer analysis, would be found resulting from another factor entirely different from

racial psychology. The educated middle class in the North and those in the learned professions are feeling the competition of more talented people from the South and out of a sense of inferiority complex they are now parading with a superior ancestry. Instead of inquiring into the causes which make the South Indians to be at an advantage when compared to the Northerners in the learned professions, which causes are mostly greater literacy, lower cost for education, awareness, respect and willingness to study and appreciate other people's culture and languages, the North Indians have raised this bluff boasting about their fathers, than about themselves. Interested politicians exploit the tendency to the greatest possible advantage with the result that these various provincials are gradually beginning to regard themselves as separate nationals and think in terms of separate nations.

From this spate of racial doctrines has come just another finding that Bengalees are a Mongol-Dravidian racial mixture. This latest theory is also not without its repercussions, some of them dramatically funny, because it has wounded the vanity of some of the Bengalee professors. As a result one of the learned Bengalee research scholars has come out lately with a contradiction to this theory after spending his whole life time digging out human skulls, measuring human anatomy and unearthing ancient archaeological relics with occasional side trackings into the realms of comparative philology by which he proves in his own estimation that Bengalees are definitely of the Indo-European racial stock and are therefore purely Aryans and thereby blood brothers to the Germans. This learned doctor's findings were widely published in the Bengali press and people in Bengal generally felt over it that they have come out of a stigma with proof for their untainted Aryan heredity. As a casual observer, what I felt over the whole episode was keen amusement at this display of senseless vanity. It would have been perfectly correct and truly

self respecting for this scholar to prove that Bengalees are pure blooded Indians instead of half castes of questionable heredity whether it be Mongolian or Aryan. What prompted this professor to seek Aryan and European ancestry is evidently his conception that Aryans are more good looking than the pure Indians, their women have softer skins and lighter shades and it would be greatly flattering and really exciting to claim common heredity with such people. In every other country and with every other people to be called half caste is insulting, while by the strange irony of fate, people here in our midst are flattered by being called half castes and take pride in their hybrid ancestry.

This mania to claim an Aryan ancestry is not of Bengalees alone, but is shared by some of the South Indians as well, for example, the Malayalees who have generally a fairer complexion than their brothers a few hundred miles to the East, and by the Telugu speaking people of Andhra. Many of the Malayalee literateurs I have heard talking about wholesale migration of Bengalees to the west coast in olden days and about the people of Malabar owing their origin to these immigrants and various other funny theories to attribute an Aryan ancestry to Malayalees. The main arguments in support are the facial resemblance between Malayalees and Bengalees in general and the prevalence of Kali or Sakti worship in both the areas. For that matter which other two people in this country are not closely allied to each other in facial features, thoughts and ways of living throughout this entire sub-continent of India and which two sets of people can disclaim blood and racial ties between one another at one time or the other in the ages that have gone past ?

Speaking about Telugus I am reminded of a talk which I had when I was travelling once from Colombo to Calcutta in company with a Telugu lawyer from Madras and a Tamilian gentleman attached to the Archæological Department. Along with other topics the conversation touched

the subject of Racialism and the ancient history of India in the light of recent archæological discoveries, particularly Harappa and Mohenjodaro. Throughout the discussion I found this Telugu gentleman animated by the theory of Aryanism, passionately arguing that Telugus are Aryan descendents and are, therefore, superior to Tamilians (I can't guess why) and in spite of our arguments to the contrary, this otherwise well-informed gentleman presented to us a sorry spectacle of the effects of this racial doctrine. This belief is shared by a large section of the Telugu speaking public right from school boys to the learned college professors, has been proved to me by subsequent observation.

Vying with the Hindus in their claims to a superior foreign ancestry, Indian Musalmans in the remotest corners of the country also have begun to think in terms of a foreign ancestry for them. The Bengali Musalman until very recently regarded Bengal as his cultural home and Bengali as his cultural heritage, but increasing numbers of educated Bengali Muslims are to-day mad after a Persian or Arab ancestry and regard Urdu or some such language with a large doze of Persian or Arabic in that as their cultural heritage rather than Bengali. The result of all these is that a growing number of Indians both Hindus and Muslims find it increasingly difficult to work in co-operation to evolve a common destiny for them all in the country to which they really belong.

I would call twentieth century's greatest philosopher, Dr. Sigmund Freud. People call him a psychologist but he is really much more than that. It was left to him to draw the attention of the people to the prominent role the sex instinct plays in all thoughts and actions including the unconscious ones. In the spreading of racialism also sex has played a great part, in fact its very origin is in sex. Nobody in the world claims to have originated from the Negro, and if one were to prove that the father of all men is a Negro, or the earliest inhabitants of the world were

Negroes, the theory however strongly supported by scientific evidence, would fall to the ground and would not gain currency however hard you might try to substantiate it. It is not science that is at the back of ethnology but plain sex and vanity. On the contrary a fictitious theory that this set of people or the other originated from the most beautiful of the Apsaras (Devas), there would be many to support it, to propagate it and to be glorious over it among those people. When an Indian says that he is an Aryan he is thinking of a fair coloured Persian or Eurasian beauty, and if it is a woman she is thinking of a virile he man, a prince charming from amongst the Eurasians. If it is a German who claims the Aryan ancestry he is invariably thinking of an oriental beauty with all the poetic grace in her, in contrast to the hefty look of his own women folk. It is sex and vanity, both go hand in hand always, that account for the racial pride and are at the bottom of all racial theories. Like racialism Art is also closely intermingled with the sex idea, in fact art expression is sex expression. If there were not enough and more of good looking women in Bengal, Bengali art would not have met with such spontaneous appreciation everywhere in India and if Malayalee girls are to take up to Kathakali instead of their men folk that would be the rage of other provincials. Even now women must be mad of this Kathakali with what they have seen of these men folk and their virile form of art expression.

Just because South Indians do not have the physical beauty, fair colour, and the sensualism of the Persians, a people who can be really called to be the originators and forefathers of everything that is genuinely Indian, whether it be Art, Culture, Philosophy, or Metaphysics are to-day stigmatised as Dravidians. Not only that, it is aggressively asserted that the source of all culture is Aryan meaning thereby that all the good things of Indian culture have been originated by the Persians and their hybrid descendants in the country, who in fact have not contributed any-

thing to India's past greatness. All that they have brought to India are the peculiar sensualism unknown in the country prior to their advent and such camouflages and evils like the Purdah, serfdom for women and a pleasure seeking attitude towards life. A greater amount of personal charm, I mean the attribute of being fair skinned, than what is attributed to the original inhabitants of India, is claimed for these foreigners, but that too I think is irrelevant. It is the blend of that characteristic Indian beauty which accounts for the charm of the hybrid descendents, and which other hybrid population in the world show a tendency different from such. But does that mean the self-respect and the greatness of a nation should be sacrificed at the altar of Venus?

It is proper that we should examine how far this Aryan theory is based on facts. The main edifice on which the theory is built is on the origin the western scholars have attributed to Sanskrit. According to some of these scholars Sanskrit is a semitic language, thereby meaning that it belongs to the same group of languages as Assyrian, Aramean, Hebrew, Phœnician, Arabic and Ethiopic, while according to others it is a descendent of the old Persian in the same family as the German. The evidence adduced in support are half a dozen similar sounds common to these languages and Sanskrit, whether they have the same meaning or root is immaterial to these gentlemen, and the peculiar grammatical declension common to Sanskrit and some of the European languages.

It is needless to elaborate on the origin of Sanskrit, what is Sanskrit and how it was evolved, since I have done it elsewhere. The facts that some of the languages resemble one another or have stray common words are not enough evidences to prove that one language originated from the other. At various stages in history contact between people inhabiting different parts of the world was possible and had occurred, though in their own cumbrous ways, and it was

not the Europeans alone who taught the world how to walk or to go from place to place. To say that Sanskrit originated from Persian or Hebrew is to say that since all languages are spoken by the mouth and not by the contortions of the hips they are all originated from one source. It is not philology nor is it common sense.

The occurrence of the word *Aryan*, both in Sanskrit and Persian does not indicate that both the languages are of the same stock. *Aryan* in Persian or in the European languages has a meaning entirely different from what the word signifies in Sanskrit. To-day's German scholars are however inclined to take the meaning of this word in Sanskrit as the more appropriate to define their supermen. *Aryan* in Sanskrit has no such significance, it only means noble or cultured and every Indian wife in those days called her husband *Arya putra* (the noble born) and the husband a wife as *Arye* or *Arya* with no racial significance attached to the word. The very fact that the culture of India is different from the culture of any other region on the face of the earth is more than valid evidence to prove that this culture and all that it represents are indigenous to the country. If the foreigners brought a culture to this country it is more than likely they would have left traces of it on their trail nearer home and in the surrounding regions. They could not have lifted everything stock and barrel and shifted to India leaving no trace behind, to develop it here; they couldn't have possibly flown from Central Asia to India without even pausing on the way. If they did not fly then the culture of Iran, Central Asia, Turkey, Turkistan, Caucasus and Urals must be pretty close to ours, but on a detailed examination or analysis they are not; whatever semblance they have now in the form of crude tribal customs are all later manifestations resulting from intercourse during the middle ages. When we talk of the origin of Sanskrit we have got to go far beyond these middle ages and what superficial semblance the European sees in every-

thing oriental right from the Urals to the tip of the Malay Peninsula and the Japanese Sea. It would be pretty easy to put everything oriental into one smooth little egg and cover it with a big palm, and that has been accomplished already politically, but in the realm of science, philology or Archæology one cannot adopt the same political stunts and arrive at conclusions.

Swami Vivekanand though not the first to contradict this sinister Aryan Dravidian theory was by far the most authoritative in his criticism for Swamiji's knowledge of Sanskrit and scholarship in ancient Indian and world literature were much greater than that of the present day philologists or Archæologists who knowing to write the Sanskrit characters in addition to half a dozen European languages feel themselves as authorities on Sanskrit literature. However Vivekananda's criticism failed to arrest the spreading of this theory not because it lacked authority but because his was the lone voice of a pure blooded Indian in an ocean of half castes. Added to this, the authorities took every occasion to include the theory as conclusively proven statement of fact in every school text-book, Primer, and work of reference.

It struck me as ridiculous that one of the distinguishing features, cited by these authorities, between Aryans and Dravidians is the difference in the mode of dress. How superficial such observations are, would be evident to any Indian who has seen the country, studied its people, their customs ancient and modern with dispassionate interest. The Indian way of wearing the Dhoty taking it between the legs and tucking at the back is peculiar to this country and has no parallel either in Asia or elsewhere. This system has endured since time immemorial and this has been the national dress from the Himalayas to the Cape without distinction. Every South Indian even to-day wears the Dhoty in the same way at every religious ceremony and a generation ago the custom was universal in the south to

wear the Dhoty in that manner. The present mode of wearing the Dhoty adopted mostly by the younger generation is a recent adaptation from the Malayan and the Moorish people, Arabs included, as a matter of convenience and economy. Amongst the many other things which are peculiar and original to this country, the Dhoty and the Sari as the modes of dress bear the same stamp of tradition and originality.

I am intolerant with anything that spoils our unity as a people whether it be religion, racialism or provincialism, for a country which wants to go ahead and be a great power in the world cannot afford to be disunited. Our dis-union is the result of a tendency amongst us to exaggerate minor differences and overlook all points of similarity symbolic of an inherent unity between the various elements in the country. If we can attain that unity by a system of regimentation or by an aggressive racial theory or by any other means, we have to tread that path with determination, for in our unity lies the destiny of this great country. Liberalism is an excuse for inefficiency and is a product of desultory thinking with no constructive ideals. When we shall have reached our goal we may relapse into liberalism, but till then we have got to tie our belts tight and fight the way out of the dirty mire in which we have been thrown. Such a feeling of tension and sacrifice can only come when every man feels that he is part and parcel of a country which is the greatest nation on earth, by its past and its future, if not the immediate present. If the teachers refuse to take note of the times it is left for the taught to bring them to their senses. We had enough of this appreciation of other people's greatness and it is time that we estimated our own strength and thought in terms of it.

CHAPTER X.

The Problem of Minorities.

A minority in a country is that part of the population, hybrid or otherwise, who for any length of time have remained incapable of being absorbed into the fabric of the nation for some reason or the other, and who for that matter are unwilling to make common cause with the rest of the population for the sake of the country and are not prepared to make sacrifices for the country to the same extent as the rest and who are disposed to regard the interests of the sect or the minority to which they belong more worthy of attention than the claims and the needs of the country they inhabit. Such minorities can be entirely alien to the soil and opposed to the legitimate interests and aspirations of the majority of the people or may be the result of social ostracism or isolation and for that cause feel that in a Government controlled by the majority their interests would be jeopardised and their claims overlooked unless adequate safeguards are provided in the constitution. The problem of each of these minorities needs a different solution.

Among the minorities in India are the Muslims, the untouchables, the Parsees, the Anglo-Indians, the Indian Christians, the Sikhs, and the Europeans. The minorities can be multiplied if one is to take into account the various other minor religious groups, sects or communities but for

our consideration it would be sufficient to examine the problem of the larger minorities.

Muslims are by far the largest minority, in the sense they constitute between one-fourth to one-third of the total population and are in a majority in some of the provinces and for that matter can claim for themselves the right to govern such provinces applying the majority principle underlying Democracy. These people cannot be classed on the whole as a hybrid population for most of them are converts from the original population, that is Hindus, largely from the lower strata, that is untouchables, but have grown definitely hybrid and alien to the soil by reason of their religious faith or ideology, call it what you will, and share in every respect the definition of minority set forth at the beginning of this Chapter. For the reason that most of the original converts came from the socially ostracised section of the Hindu community, it has not been possible for them to outgrow their original psychology of hatred against the majority population born out of inferiority complex and the past social ostracism. The upper strata of the Muslim society are the hybrid descendents of the Muslim foreigners who conquered and ruled the country for centuries and for that reason still retain their hostility towards the local population lurking in their minds, though some of them have begun to identify themselves with the country and the cause as a result of reasoned thinking. I do not deny the existence of similar traces of hostility to the entire Muslim culture on the part of the Hindus for the same reasons.

As far as the first aspect of psychology is concerned the Muslims share it with the untouchables which can be solved by a radical change in the organisation of society and prior to such by legislation barring social ostracism of any kind. As regards the other a new angle in the teaching of history and a new orientation towards the country can be really helpful. With all these the problem of Hindu Muslim animosity can never be solved permanently unless free

intercourse including inter-marriage on a considerably larger scale between the two communities can be established. This would mean the fusion of the two communities into one compact whole. All the rest of the solutions are temporary and are patch-work which would afford no lasting results, whether it be Pakistan, Akhand Hindustan or Myriadistans. For this purpose effective legislation removing all barriers for such union backed with one hundred machine guns to book the religious hooligans would do the job in less time than anticipated, provided of course, there are a dozen capable leaders among both the communities to set the example. By persistent propaganda such inter-communal unions can be made as glorious as possible so that it would be followed up by the people on a large scale. But these are all impossible so long as old heads worry our lives, worn out ideas and religious foibles thwart our thinking and tradition obstructs our progress.

In the meanwhile let us consider some of these patch work solutions.

It does not help my solution to survey the history of Muslim politics or the influence of the British Arm in the communal triangle. For the latter I would refer the reader to Achut Patwardhan and Asoke Mehta's "*Communal Triangle in India*," pretty well written that book is. If you consider dispassionately however, there would be instances where the British arm has extended its sympathies to the Congress and the Hindus as opposed to the League and the Muslims, and the history of Muslim politics would be as incongruous as Congress politics in their relationship with the British arm at different stages in their history. I am also not disposed to regard Gandhiji and his ideas as representing the quintessence of Indian or Hindu political aspirations or Mr. Jinnah and his ideas as representing the Muslim mind. For the time being these two personalities have control of two rival organisations and their rivalry have given different shapes to these organisations, and it is

unlikely, both of them living, for these two organisations to merge, subordinate one to the other or work in perfect cooperation. With the advent of new personalities new colours may be added to this picture. Muslim League may turn more reasonable, so may Congress or it may be likely that they will come together, merge or co-operate. These are all uncertainties, one cannot predict so easily, but one thing is certain that the Hindu mind and the Muslim mind will not show any remarkable change in their vision of life for some years to come, whether a revolution takes place in the meanwhile or not. A Muslim would not regard a Hindu just as he regards another Muslim nor a Hindu would regard a Muslim just as he regards another Hindu. Exceptions occur, but basically and in general the tendency would be there so long as religion dominates thought.

From to-day's standpoint Muslim League represents the more vociferous section of the Muslims and somehow or other has come to be regarded as representative of Muslim nationalism in general. For this reason it is best to consider the demands of the Muslim League as representing the majority Muslim view point, and in any case, a settlement of the Muslim demands can only be accomplished through the agency of the League, however reactionary its leaders may be. It is only an irony of fate of the Musalmans that fanaticism should still be the criterion of their political judgment and the error of their judgment will have to be lived through by them. No amount of good intentioned advice would do the work.

As far as possible I shall try to put these demands in the words of the Muslim League and its spokesmen, for if I attempt to put it in my own words I might be accused as being dishonest or partial.

Of all the demands which have been put forth Pakistan takes the topmost place in its romantic appeal and in view of its disastrous consequences, if impartially viewed. The germ of Pakistan was expounded by Sir Mahomed Iqbal at

the Allahabad Session of the All India Muslim League in 1930 in his Presidential address in the following terms.

"I would like to see the Punjab, North West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single state. Self-government within the British Empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim State appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims at least of North West India.

"I therefore demand the formation of a consolidated Muslim state in the best interests of India and Islam. For India it means security and peace resulting from an internal balance of power, for Islam an opportunity to rid itself of the stamp that Arabian Imperialism was forced to give it, to mobilise its law, its education, its culture, and to bring them into closer contact with its own original spirit of modern times." This germ took practical shape and became the ultimate goal of the Muslim League ten years later, in 1940, when at the Lahore Session Mr. M. A. Jinnah, the President gave the dictum :

"It is extremely difficult to appreciate why our Hindu friends fail to understand the real nature of Islam and Hinduism. They are not religions in the strict sense of the word, but are, in fact, different and distinct social orders and it is a dream that the Hindus and Muslims can ever evolve a common nationality, and this misconception of one Indian nation has gone far beyond the limits and is the cause of most of our troubles and will lead India to destruction if we fail to revise our notions in time. The Hindus and Muslims belong to two different religious philosophies, social customs, literature. They neither inter-marry, nor inter-dine together, and indeed they belong to two different civilizations which are based mainly on conflicting ideas and conceptions. Their aspects on life and of life are different. It is quite clear that Hindus and Musalmans derive their inspiration from different sources of history. They have different epics, their heroes are

different, and different episodes. Very often the hero of one is a foe of the other and likewise their victories and defeats overlap. To yoke together two such nations under a single state, one as a numerical minority and the other as a majority, must lead to growing discontent and final destruction of any fabric that may be so built up for the Government of such a state."

The official resolution defining Pakistan adopted at the same session is in the following terms:—

"It is the considered view of this Session of the All India Muslim League that no constitutional plan would be workable in this country or acceptable to the Muslims unless it is designed on the following basic principle, *viz.*, that geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary, that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority as in the North Western and Eastern Zones of India should be grouped to constitute "Independent State" in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign.

"That adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards should be specifically provided in the constitution for minorities in these units and in the regions for the protection of their religions, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them and in other parts of India where the Mussalmans are in a minority adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards shall be specifically provided in the constitution for them and other minorities for the protection of their religions, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them.

"This Session further authorises the Working Committee to frame a scheme of constitution in accordance with these basic principles, providing for the assumption finally by the respective regions of all powers such as defence, external affairs, communications, customs, and such other matt-

ers as may be necessary. "

The above represents the demands in connection with Pakistan while the following are Mr. Jinnah's fourteen points formulated much earlier (in 1929) and run as follows: -

" The League after anxious and careful consideration most earnestly and emphatically lays down that no scheme for the future constitution of the Government of India will be acceptable to Mussalmans of India until and unless the following basic principles are given effect to and provisions are embodied therein to safeguard their rights and interests: -

1. The form of the future constitution should be federal with the residuary powers vested in the Provinces.
2. A uniform measure of autonomy shall be granted to all provinces.
3. All legislatures in the country and other elected bodies shall be constituted on the definite principle of adequate and effective representation of minorities in every Province without reducing the majority in any Province to a minority or even equality.
4. In the Central Legislature, Mussalman representation shall not be less than one-third.
5. Representation of communal groups shall continue to be by means of separate electorates as at present: provided it shall be open to any community, at any time, to abandon its separate electorate in favour of joint electorate.
6. Any territorial redistribution that might at any time be necessary shall not in any way, affect the Muslim majority in the Punjab, Bengal and N. W. F. Province.
7. Full religious liberty, *i. e.* liberty of belief, worship and observance, propaganda, association and education shall be guaranteed to all communities.

8. No bill or Resolution or any part thereof shall be passed in any legislature or any other elected body if three-fourths of the members of any community in that particular body oppose such a bill, resolution or part thereof on the ground that it would be injurious to the interests of that community or in the alternative, such other method is devised as may be found feasible and practicable to deal with such cases.
9. Sind should be separated from the Bombay Presidency.
10. Reforms should be introduced in the N. W. F. Province and Baluchistan on the same footing as in other Provinces.
11. Provision should be made in the constitution giving Muslims adequate share along with the other Indians, in all Services of State, and in local self-governing bodies having due regard to the requirements of efficiency.
12. The constitution should embody adequate safeguards for the protection of Muslim culture and for the protection and promotion of Muslim education, language, religion, personal laws and Muslim charitable institutions and for their due share in the grants-in-aid given by the state and by local self-governing bodies.
13. No Cabinet, either Central or Provincial, should be formed without there being a proportion of at least one third Muslim Ministers.
14. No change shall be made in the constitution by the Central Legislature except with the concurrence of the states constituting the Indian Federation."

These have been quoted verbatim from the so to say official biographer of the League, Mohammad Noman from his book "*Muslim India*" (Kitabistan).

In addition to these fourteen points, some of which have become out of date, Mr. Jinnah, the League President presented in June 1938 a further set of eleven demands to the Indian National Congress which are :

1. The *Vande Mataram* song should be given up ;
2. Muslim majorities in the Provinces where such majorities exist at present must not be affected by any territorial redistribution or adjustment ;
3. Muslims' practice of cow slaughter should not be interfered with ;
4. Muslims' right to call Azan and perform their religious ceremonies should not be interfered with in any way ;
5. Muslims' personal law and culture should be guaranteed by statute ;
6. The share of the Muslims in the state services should be definitely fixed in the constitution by a statutory enactment ;
7. The Congress should withdraw all opposition to the communal award, and should not describe it as a negation of nationalism ;
8. Statutory guarantee should be given that the use of Urdu shall not be curtailed ;
9. Representation in local bodies should be governed by the principles underlying the communal award, that is, separate electorates and popular strength ;
10. The tri-colour flag should be changed or alternatively the flag of the Muslim League should be given equal importance.
11. Recognition of the League as the one and only authoritative and representative organisation of the Indian Muslims.

We have got to consider these demands one by one. Sir Mohammad Iqbal is in a way correct. If religion is to dominate our political vision, Islam can ill go together

with Hinduism. To the real India this alien element would be a dead weight on their shoulders restricting their progress in every walk of life, for in every measure calculated to reform the society and bring it up to date and to organise politics on a modern basis (on socialist lines or otherwise) they have got to think in terms of the veto of this minority with the result they would never be able to radically reform the country. I should think the Hindu Mahasabha should press for Pakistan and wholesale transfer of populations rather than the Muslim League, for thereby it would be the Hindus who would stand to gain by such isolation of alien and reactionary elements obstructing their political destiny. I am definitely certain, if the Mahasabha makes Pakistan an insistant demand the present Muslim leaders would not find it so glorious to strut as apostles of Pakistan.

It would be found that the Muslims are not prepared to think politics as divorced from religion, as would be evident from the following quotation from "Punjabi's" "*Confederacy of India*", in which case I do not understand in what manner would it be possible to work out a common Government to suit the needs of Hindûs and Muslims. According to "Punjabi".

"The Muslims cannot divorce their religion from their politics. In Islam, religious and political beliefs are not separated from each other. Religion and politics are inseparably associated in their minds and thoughts of all Muslims. Their religion includes their politics and their politics are a part of their religion. The Mosque not only constitutes a place of worship but also the Assembly Hall. They are born into a system. The system is not thrust on them. Religion and politics are the same to them. Hence Hindu-Muslim unity or nationalism, signifying homogeneity between them in all non-religious matters, is unimaginable. The Islamic policy in which religion and politics are inseparably united requires perfect isolation for its development.

The idea of a common state with heterogenous membership is alien to Islam and can never be fruitful."

Though these Muslim leaders are looking forth to perfect isolation and a complete break from the rest of India, they are looking forth to alliances elsewhere and the balance of power is not going to be maintained within the country for the sake of peace as Sir Mahomed Iqbal visualises, but outside India as would be evident from this quotation from "*India's Problem of Her Future Constitution*" with a preface by Mr. M. A. Jinnah.

"Islamic political problems are everywhere of an allied nature. Liberation of one Muslim country will directly affect another. The fate of Muslims in India will have direct repercussions in other parts of the world, particularly in the Western Provinces of China and Southern and Eastern parts of Russia, where Muslims are in a majority. Acceptance of minority status within the sub-continent of India will besides sealing once for all the fate of 90 million Muslims in India lead to permanent enslavement of 30 millions of Muslims in Soviet Russia and 50 Millions in Western China."

In addition to these, the already independent States of Afghanistan, Arabia, Turkey, Iraq, Iran and Egypt help to form the global Pakistan. As opposed to this, if the Hindu Mahasabha chooses to visualise a global Hindustan composed of Hindu India with the Budhist States of Burma, Thailand, China and Japan (since Budhism is so closely allied to Hinduism as to be called its offspring), medie-valism would be resuscitated with a number of crusades to follow. Unfortunately neither the Russian nor the Chinese Muslims are prepared to follow Mr. Jinnah's Caliphate, nor do Turkey or the other Muslim States feel inclined to join this Global Pakistan of Mount Pleasant Road origin, there seems to be less likelihood of a partition of Asia on these lines.

Pakistan is neither a proposition nor a demand yet to

be conceded as so many people think and therefore discuss its merits and demerits, for Mr. Jinnah has made it clear that nothing short of it would satisfy the Muslims. At the Madras Session of the Muslim League to repeat Mr. Jinnah's own words :

“ Let me tell you as clearly as I can possibly do so that the goal of the All India Muslim League is that we want to establish a completely independent state in the North West and the Eastern Zones of India, with full control finally of defence, currency, exchange, etc. We do not want under any circumstances a constitution of an All India character with one Government at the centre. We will never agree to that. If you once agree to it, let me tell you that the Muslims would be absolutely wiped out of existence.”

In the face of such, it is foolish to argue that one can substitute something else for this Pakistan, same as it would be for British Government to say that they can substitute something else for the complete independence which the Indian National Congress demands for India. If the National Congress will not be satisfied with anything short of complete independence how can the Muslim League be satisfied with something less than Pakistan. It is yet another thing to consider whether the Muslim League is as representative of the Muslim community as the Congress is of Indians. That will be settled at the time of the Constituent Assembly.

I am not visualising a fight between the Hindus and the Muslims over this question of Pakistan, but I definitely foresee the possibility of a fight between the Muslims and Muslims over this question of Pakistan on the same lines as the civil war between the two groups of North American States over the question of Union or non-Union. It all depends on how we tackle the whole thing. If the Muslim League really wants to emerge as representing the urge of the Muslim masses and the progressive forces in the

community, it has to climb down from this Pakistan and instead of supporting it oppose vivisection tooth and nail. That is the touch stone by which we can test the claims of the present leadership, and if it so happens that the Muslims all of them or the majority at least want it, well, we cannot deny them. That is their right and their choice, however uncomfortable that might be to our sentiment, to our cause and the larger issues involved in it. That historical event of a wholesale invasion of India, the fact that large masses of people surrendered to the foreign spell, all these things cannot be erased or ignored by us so easily, unless of course, we are prepared to fight for the unity and the forceful subjugation of the minority under the dominating will of the Nation. But then co-operation and democracy will have to be shelved to achieve this aim.

One thing has also to be considered that without being given full liberty the Muslims will not be able to live out their fanatical religious zeal and cool their heads to think of constructive social measures to radicalise the life and thoughts of the masses, or in the words of Sir Mahomed Iqbal, "For Islam an opportunity to rid itself of the stamp that Arabian Imperialism was forced to give it." Till such opportunity is afforded, Muslims as a whole would live under the delusion of a national home outside the boundaries of India and would never think of India, in spite of their and their forefathers' being born and brought up in this country as their spiritual homeland. They would thereby continue to live as aliens in their own mother country just because that country happens to be the homeland of the Hindus.

However, the protagonists of Pakistan do not consider the fact that the solution is not so simple as it sounds. In what way Jinnah is going to settle the problem of the Hindu, Sikh and other minorities in his own Pakistan? If they are also to formulate some twenty five demands on the same lines as his fourteen and eleven, what sort of

liberty for reform and administration would be left for his own compatriots in the Pakistan? It is easy to resolve that adequate, effective and mandatory safe-guards should be provided but one only realises the difficulty when he sits down to formulate these safe-guards and administer a region in the light of such safe-guards. Furthermore, it is pretty likely that these two independent states, with all their independent armies, customs and exchange rights would have to go to war or something near to that in the economic sphere by what is called "sanctions" to have these mandatory safeguards given effect to in each of these regions. If one state has at its head a Hitler or a Jinnah with such master propagandist like Goebbels to assist in the propagation of atrocity campaigns and Deliverance Days, there would be less chances of both the states peacefully developing side by side. With these safeguards for the Hindu and Sikh minorities in his Pakistan, Jinnah would be losing on his own home front, what he aspires to gain on the All India front.

It is in such an event that we are confronted with the problem of wholesale transfer of populations from one part of Hindustan to Pakistan and vice versa. It should be considered that Hindus or Muslims are not homogeneous in themselves by matter of their religious faith, but to a very great extent are so by reason of their nativity, language and customs. The Tamilian or Malabar Muslims would not be so easily accepted as blood brothers by the Punjabi Muslims nor would the former find Punjab as homely as their own places of birth. The same applies to the Hindus of the Punjab if they are to be shifted elsewhere. Moreover what an endless misery it would create on the poor peasant folk to be rooted out of their own soil and transplanted elsewhere, though to these politicians it may look something like a game of chess. For this very reason alone a plebiscite of Muslims in such regions would declare against Pakistan in all probability. One should also con-

sider that if the Hindus or Sikhs in the Pakistan regions are to decide to the last man that they would not agree to such Pakistan being constituted, by what logic can Jinnah isolate them from the rest of India, for they are as much a minority in those regions as the Muslims are on the All India plane. Furthermore Jinnah claims that secular systems of Government or education would not be suited to Muslims and thereby if Pakistan is to be governed and educated on Islamic religious lines, how and in what manner the Muslim League expects the Hindus and the Sikhs in those regions to put up with these? It would be pretty intolerant for Muslims if such minorities objected to a Muslim National Flag and a Muslim National Anthem and by some freak chance developed a fancy to adopt pig breeding on a wide scale. It is pitiable that we should break our heads on such freakish things without being able to come to a workable understanding.

About the demands regarding *Vande Mataram* cow slaughter and Tri-colour Flag, I find no reason why the Indian National Congress should be unable to come to some understanding with the Muslim League. It does not make any difference if we sing the *internationale* or some other thing provided we can reconcile our feelings to that and reach a common measure of agreement among ourselves. If *Vande Mataram* wounds the sentiment of some one else it would be pretty easy for us to compose just another suited to both. So also in the case of the tri-colour flag if the League would be satisfied, a crescent can be added instead of the Charkha or some such sort of thing to please the Muslims. As regards cow slaughter even to-day nobody objects to cows being slaughtered in slaughter houses, but if Muslims take pride and gain sentimental satisfaction in doing it in the open, well, let them do it. So many Christians breed pigs, slaughter them and do whatever they like with them, but I have not come across an instance of a communal riot engineered by Muslims in protest. The

whole defect in this cow slaughter business has been that some have done it wilfully to excite the passion of the Hindus and the Muslim leaders by some neurotic tendency of theirs have found pleasure in abetting such spiteful actions. If the Hindus just disregarded the whole thing and minded their own business, instead of getting excited over it there would have been less chances of cow slaughter becoming a glorious religious act. In time to come Muslims would themselves realise that instead of killing cows and restricting the breeding of cattle it would be best to conserve them and eat the bulls or goat, for after all, India is not a desert like Arabia where cattle can be of no use, but a purely agricultural country depending on cattle for farm labour and for milk. India by no flight of imagination can be converted into Arabia and it would be rank folly to live in India and think of Arabia.

The demand regarding the future constitution and the measure of autonomy for the Provinces, it is premature to split one's head over residuary powers being vested in the centre or the Provinces. The Hindu attitude can be clearly understood in demanding powers to be vested in the centre, for they are thinking in terms of a nation and a powerful state to back up the Nation's progress while the Muslims are thinking themselves in terms of a minority wanting to grab in their own hands as much power as possible, for which a powerful state at the centre is not very helpful. If Mr. Jinnah himself sets to the task of building up his own Pakistan into a powerful state, progressive in all respects, assuring the maximum of benefit for the people, he would himself begin to feel the limitations a system with residuary powers vested in the Provinces would impose on him. After all it does not matter for the Muslims whether India falls asunder, is divided between various powers and groans under disunity, for majority of them still think of India as that of the Hindus', a foreign country where they are just settlers yearning to go back to the sacred land

where they came from. Without measure of agreement being arrived at for the joint control of the Army, Customs, Exchange and Communications, there would be no good coming out of any governance of the country, whether it be by Autonomous Republics or Caliphs. If such matters can be left to the Central Government any amount of autonomy can be granted to the Provinces, for the entire point of contest springs out of mutual jealousy and animosity rather than common sense and statesmanship. This term autonomy has gained some romantic hue in the country because of the Communists using the term in and out of season to present their glorious Russian regime, which however on closer examination works on different principles. If self delusion is a worth while profession and sentimental satisfaction approaches real satisfaction, I think for a Government on Russian lines, which would be more than ample to meet our needs, we can call it a Union or confederation of super-autonomous Republics with residuary and extra residuary powers vested in the Provinces.

The demands 3, 4, 5, 11, and 13 out of the fourteen points and numbers 6, 7 and 9 of the eleven points are more or less similar and the roots of all these lie in the suspicion on the part of the minorities that the majority on access to power would ride rough shod over the interests of the minority and monopolise every field of activity to their exclusion. This suspicion is perfectly legitimate, and if anybody is to be blamed for this, I can only blame the Hindus. You cannot gain the confidence and good will of the other, when in every action of yours you treat that other as some one inferior worth not taking into confidence. Ages of mistrust and social isolation between the two communities cannot be forgotten just in one day. In India the tendency is common in all walks of life and with all people to distrust anybody who is not one's own kith or kin or at least of the same clan, community, caste or province, and in the face of it how can you expect people of two different religions to

trust one another on a larger scale. Take any enterprise in the country which is manned entirely by Indians, analyse its personnel and draw your own conclusions out of that. I am pretty sure if you are not mean or selfish, you would feel enough justification for the Muslims insisting on the communal award, separate electorates and reservation of offices and employment. You may point out that Hindus employ an army of *Durwans*, menials or clerks or something of that sort, and if that be your basis of comparison, I do not know how are you justified in protesting against Englishmen. Do they not employ you by the thousands and tens of thousands retaining some hundreds of posts for them. The acid test of sincerity is not the number of jobs thrown open in the lower grades, but the confidence you repose in the community and the number you assign with responsibility in a measure equal to what you would assign to your own community folk. Until such time the two communities develop more intimate social relations, communal awards, separate electorates, reservation of offices and such other things must stay, and the Muslims and other minorities are perfectly justified in demanding these. I have heard men of the calibre of Rabindranath Tagore protesting against the communal award, but how many of Bengalee Hindus would allow Muslims to enter their houses or keep company with. This is true with Hindus not only in Bengal but in every part of the country and as a reaction to such preferential treatments the Muslims are also being driven to such methods.

The demand in connection with the territorial redistribution (No. 6 out of the 14 points and No. 2 of the 11 points) is, one should call, getting afraid of one's own shadow. Jinnah created the devil out of his Pakistan, and to-day he is afraid the same devil would devour him. It was not the Hindus who mooted the suggestion of a partition, territorial re-distribution, or the transfer of populations from one region to another. When once you accept a

principle and press for its adoption, you cannot say that the other party should desist from adopting the same principle if he finds it advantageous to him. You pressed for the separation of Sind with a view to gain a Muslim majority in one more Province, but the same you now come forward with the dictum that there should be no such re-distributions again. I do not think even Adolf Hitler would be that much audacious.

The first part of demand No. 8 is as much preposterous as the above, in the sense that by giving effect to the demand the minority would gain the power to veto any measure which the majority want to bring forth, which is rather an impossible provision in any constitution. It is alright to demand that such a measure should not be applied to the minority community or something thereabout and not in these wholesale terms.

Regarding religious rights and liberty, I do not think there would be much trouble in getting these demands accepted by the Hindus, for after all, if they are to have these rights, they cannot deny similar rights to others. But if they are going to renounce such, there would be less justification for the Muslims to insist, but even then, such a demand can be conceded looking to the peculiar mind of the Muslims in general.

Of all the most noteworthy is the last one of the eleven demands, that is recognition of the League as the one and only authoritative and representative organisation of the Indian Muslims. Asoke Melita and Achut Patwardhan have preferred to call this the sting in the tail, and I should think nothing can be more appropriate than that. By such an act Mr. Jinnah wants to get a thing done which he and his League have been unable to accomplish with all these years of virulent communal politics. If Jinnah can claim to represent all Mussalmans why should he be afraid of a Constituent Assembly of all Muslims, for what else can afford a better opportunity to prove his undisputed leader-

ship over all the Muslims. Yet Mr. Jinnah would be the last to allow his pet scheme of Pakistan to be decided by a Constituent Assembly.

We have considered all the claims of the Muslim League, but one is disposed to ask, after all for what? We have made much of this prior agreement with Mr. Jinnah, the League and the Muslims, but how far this agreement is going to help India gain her independence? From what we have seen of Mr. Jinnah and his League, we can be pretty sure that these gentlemen would be the last to undergo the least of suffering for the cause of the country's independence. I do not say this applies to the general body of Muslims, for some of the best fighters for the country's freedom have been born in that community. Englishmen and Americans to the last man would admit that Mr. Jinnah is the most astute of all Indian politicians including Gandhi and who else in the Empire deserves a Peerage better than Mr. Jinnah!

We in India cannot afford to leave this problem of Hindu Muslim relations unsolved for all time to come, for this has been the greatest single factor which has stood in the way of the country's progress. By some peculiar circumstances, in India religious nationalism is more deep rooted than economic or political nationalism, and for that reason, if we say we have more than one nation in our country we are only accepting a fact which is already existing but not understood by us fully. In enunciating this theory of more than one nation in a country, I do not entertain the slightest idea that this should necessarily result in more than one state to represent all these nations. By applying this theory let us examine in what manner and to what extent we shall be able to solve the problem of nationalities.

Granting that since religion forms the basis of all thought (I am talking of India only), Religious Nationalism is the only true Nationalism, it is left to the Nationals themselves to determine to what extent this

religion and the nationalism involved in it can be subordinated to economic and political necessities. If one set of Nationals determine that they are not prepared to subordinate religion to economic and political needs, the Government we evolve must be elastic enough to accommodate these people and give them the legitimate freedom to exercise their choice and be governed accordingly. At the same time if the other Nation people or part of them decide that their Nationalism should be merged with the state and for that purpose are prepared to abandon the superficial crust distinguishing their nationalism, the new state should be so organised as to be representative of such people also. At first sight such a state would seem beyond conception, to be capable of harnessing the most reactionary and primitive ideals with the medium, progressive and the ultra progressive ones on a smooth basis leaving room for the primitive set of people to advance on progressive lines at their own choice and free will. But such is not the case, would be evident, by a closer study of the scheme.

Any form of Government must be decided by the people themselves (every adult male and female without any other qualifying terms to define their eligibility being included in this) and not superimposed by a party, race or oligarchy. This can only be decided by a Constituent Assembly in which every such individual takes part and votes knowing fully well the consequences of his vote to the best of his ability and in the light he is capable of viewing. In a country where there are more than one nation there needs to be as many such Assemblies as there are nations to decide to what extent these various nationalities are prepared to surrender their nationalism to the cause of the state which is in the process of evolution. The majority decision of each of such Constituent Assemblies would bind the rest and would be the basis for surrendering such rights of Nationalism. This can be modified to suit the general will. The Constitution of the State itself would be decided

by a general Constituent Assembly as distinct from the Nationalities Assemblies, in which General Assembly would take part all adults without distinction of sex or nationality and the majority decision of such Assembly would determine the Constitution best suited for the country or state in general of which these various nations form part.

To be more explicit let us take the concrete example of India with two or more nations within one state, *viz.*, Hindu, Muslim, Christian, Sikh, etc. If the Muslim Nationalities Assembly decide that they would not have anything to do with the idea of one Indian State, and instead want Pakistan and Hindustan, two independent and by implication rival states with different armies, and state regulations, there would be no question of a General Constituent Assembly at all, since the two rival Constitutions would be settled by the respective Nationalities Assemblies in the way they choose, and future adjustments and treaties between these two would be settled according to the might of each of these two nations with the Hindu minority in Pakistan forming the hostages in the hands of the Muslims and the Muslim minorities in Hindustan forming the hostages in the hands of the Hindus to settle rival claims, and as fittest measures for coercion. But we have already had a glimpse of the awful perspective in European politics and it would be a terrible tragedy if we have to repeat that here. On the other hand if the Muslim Nationalities Assembly decide in favour of one unified Government, with of course safeguards which may be either Mr. Jinnah's twenty five points or another thirty six, then the Constitution placed before the General Assembly would include such safeguards and indicate the machinery to administer such safeguards and keep watch whether the administration overrides such stipulations or not. In the same manner the Hindu Nationalities Assembly and the other Nationalities Assemblies would decide over their own special safeguards and requirements and such other relevant

details which they would desire to be included in the Constitution.

The reader would be naturally anxious at this stage as to how such a constitution would fit in with the ideals of equality of opportunity and reward and how far would we be required to sacrifice these ideals at the altar of a communal settlement.

It would be in the best interests of the Nationalities themselves that this Central Government is mobilised by a party which excludes religion from all its activities for such a party can alone run the Government impartially. By running a religious party for a Government both the Nationalities would have reason to grudge over the success of one against the other. From this the principle set out earlier in the book that it should be a condition for members of the party to sign a pledge renouncing their adherence to religion in all matters affecting the state and in all laws promulgated in regard to state and social relations, gains added support. However to satisfy the needs of the minorities it can be agreed that all offices would be distributed purely in the ratio of the actual population of the various nationalities. Since the membership of the party would be a matter of political conviction inspired by the highest of ideals it would be improper to fix that this membership should stick to a communal ratio. Since the party excludes and in its ideals is more or less antagonistic to the creeds of religion in general, such a question does not arise at all, and as general enlightenment increases people would themselves abandon the artificial restraint of religion from all their thoughts and actions and begin to behave as normal human beings free and unfettered. At such a stage the party would represent the state as well as the nation and it would embrace the whole section of the people striving after higher forms of liberty and advancement.

When the constitution is agreed upon and the regime

established on these ideals, the future governance giving effect to these ideals should deserve consideration. Since one nation or other according to their relative progress and their idea of stake in the country would decide in all likelihood to stay away as far as religion and personal laws are concerned from the regime, it would be necessary to devise a machinery to regulate their actions and give effect to their desires and administer their needs. This is proposed by the creation of two or more permanent assemblies in the same way as our present legislatures consisting of the Legislative Assembly and the Council or like the two Houses of Parliament. In our conception, however, neither of these Assemblies would exercise a power superior to that of the other. Any legal measure or legislation would first be introduced and passed in the Legislative or State Assembly for which the party would run its candidates and the measure when passed by this Assembly would become law as far as the state and the citizens are concerned. This however would not become law affecting the nationalities unless it is ratified by the respective permanent Nationalities Assemblies to which the measure would be referred by the Legislative Assembly after being passed in that body. If the Nationalities Assembly ratifies the measure the law would affect the Nationalities concerned in the same way as it affects the citizen, but if it chooses to reject the people attached to the nationality would be guided by the existing religious laws or such other laws the Nationalities Assembly chooses to promulgate. Such measures would be moved by the members of the respective Nationalities Assembly and passed in the usual manner and would not be referred to the State Assembly unless the measure be of such a nature as to violate the constitution or its fundamentals in which case the power of veto would lie with the President of the State. Legislation affecting the political or economic subjects *e. g.* transport, customs, army, navy, exchange, and other matters would be outside the scope of the

Nationalities Assembly whose domain would be restricted to legislation affecting religion, education, culture and social relations of a purely personal nature which are currently guided by religion and religious laws. The party would not run candidates for this Assembly which would be contested by the nationals who do not choose to register as citizens and members of other nationalities would not be permitted to vote in this Assembly. For example, a Hindu would not be permitted to vote for the Muslim Nationalities Assembly, but is only eligible to vote for the Hindu Nationalities Assembly unless he becomes converted to Islam. To digress on this matter it seems to me to be an equitable agreement that no future conversions from one religion to another should be recognised so that there would be no rival religious propaganda. This of course is subject to general agreement between the different nationalities on a reciprocal basis, for instance if Muslims are permitted to convert from other communities the same facilities should be afforded to other communities to convert from Muslims.

As indicated earlier the Assemblies would be on the basis of adult suffrage with no property or educational qualifications. For the State Assembly every adult male and female irrespective of nationality would be eligible to vote, but no party organised on a religious basis would be permitted to run its candidates or contest for seats. Since State matters are extraneous to the domain of religion, religious or communal parties can not take part in such matters and their sphere is restricted to the Nationalities Assembly for which candidates may be run on any desirable basis under any party affiliations they choose. Any member of a nationality may renounce his nationality and forfeit his right to vote for the Nationalities Assembly by registering himself as a citizen of the State in which case he would be subject to all laws which are passed by the State Assembly, and in consequence, would not be bound by the decisions of the Nationalities Assembly or its regulations. It would

be equally open to him at any time to declare himself as a national thereby regaining his right to vote for the Nationalities Assembly and to be bound by its laws, subject to the condition that whatever contracts he might have entered into in his right as a citizen free of nationality attachment would be decided and bound by the State Regulations, and Nationalities Regulations would only be applicable to his future actions and contracts. For example, a Hindu retaining the right to vote for the Hindu Nationalities Assembly renounces such right and gets married under State regulations as a citizen, by subsequently declaring himself as a Hindu National cannot escape the obligations he has contracted under the marriage and would be guided still by State regulations as far as divorce and other things are concerned, unless the other party to the marriage also chooses to register as a Hindu National. On the contrary, however, a Hindu contracting a marriage under the Hindu Nationalities regulations (presuming that this does not allow divorce) can renounce his nationality and register as a citizen thereby gaining the right to divorce, for in this case the contract becomes one between a citizen and a national which would be bound by State regulations as opposed to the Nationalities Regulations. State laws would be binding also in all contracts between different nationals.

Nationalities courts under the Jurisdiction of the respective Nationalities Assemblies to administer the religious laws and functions will have to be established, the expenses for which will be borne by the Nationalities concerned. This would be recovered in the form of taxes. State courts will be maintained and state laws will be administered at the expense of the people in general, so also State Schools and academies. It is left to the Nationalities to run their own educational institutions in the manner they think fit at their own expense if they feel secular education as imparted in the state schools is unsuited to the needs of their community. However it would be a function of the

state to enforce strict police supervision to ensure that such centres are not utilised to undermine the influence of the state as cells for counter-revolutionary propaganda with selfish intentions.

Such a Government cannot be the best form of Government, but in a muddle that is India with conflicting racialisms or nationalisms, that perhaps is the only possible choice. This would give the minorities the required independence at the same time not sacrificing the unity of the country. The Nationalities Assembly guarantees their religious liberty and cultural integrity and the stipulation to give effect to the communal ratio guarantees against the possibility of the majority usurping the minority. According to this basis in the Provinces where these present day minorities are in a majority the whole range of administrative activity would be controlled by them and if it gives them any sentimental satisfaction we can agree to call such Provinces as Pakistan, Sikhistan, Dravidastan, Usmanistan or any Blimpistan to accommodate the whims and fancies of the parties concerned.

From a realistic standpoint this will provide an opportunity of gradually infusing citizenship consciousness into the minds of the nationals, instead of attempting to violently tear them away from their moorings to which they are bound by ages of tradition and religious beliefs. As education and material progress increase, the tendency would be for more and more of these nationals to renounce their nationalism and register for the state, while in the meanwhile a place would be assured for all their present accredited leaders to be somebody in the political sphere as Presidents of the Nationalities Assemblies or as Presidents of Pakistans. By such a procedure we are neither sacrificing the principles of socialism, nor religious nationalism, nor the unity of India and what more can we desire in the present context.

There have been moments when one feels strongly as to why one must temporize with the forces of antiquity and

reaction, the established theological Diarchy and the vested interests from the Bania money lender, the feudal landlords and big industry who extract such a heavy toll from the people. But the next moment the thought comes that we can do away with these parasites in our society, if we work hard enough and long enough. And that then we will be able to build a nation of beautiful, healthy, youthful men and women who would not ask of one another the place they come from, the community or religion to which they belong to as clues to form opinions and as qualifications to repose trust ; Men and women free, open hearted, realising the glory and greatness of their country, who would look towards humanity with friendliness, tolerance, and appreciation, mindful of the present and the future, instead of being tied to the past with the dead weight of self-deception, selfishness and racial arrogance forming the core. That is the glorious India of our future and these are the plans to build such an India.

CHAPTER XI

Education

Even the question of education in India has become tinged with communalism, Hindus clamouring for one system of education while Muslims for another entirely different. The beauty is that both the systems are useless and out of date serving no purpose to the individual who schools under either of the systems. It is alright to sentimentalise over the glory of the past and dope the masses with religious superstitions to make them fit subjects to be exploited all through life economically, politically and socially.

But will our reasoning be of any avail with these gentlemen who pretend to control our destiny and who are making plans for that end? The best thing is to let them alone to do what they like in their own sphere, so long as there are people who are willing enough to fall prey to all their deception. Our task is to make the number of such persons who fall prey as small as possible in the near future and hope to reduce the number to nil at no distant date. The system of education we visualise is one which should be imparted by the state in the interests of the citizens, and this has no connection whatsoever with the education the Nationalities may decide upon for being imparted in the Nationalities Schools.

The huge problem of illiteracy can only be solved by

making Primary Education at least compulsory for all irrespective of sex. But when we think of it we must also consider the large number of adults who are past their school-going age and are as such in need of education as the children if not more. Along with the education of children it is an imperative necessity to plan adult education also on a giant scale without which we would be only biting the tip of the whole problem.

There are no two opinions on the question of making education free, for the era is past for us to regard education as one of those luxuries which the privileged classes alone are entitled to enjoy and for that reason to be exploited as a commercial proposition. Any state constituted in the interests of citizens in general cannot overlook this factor and all sorts of education right from the primary to the highest university stage should be free. The cost of education is a responsibility of the state to the citizens which should be met from the public finance. For the higher stages of education the persons to receive such would be selected according to the candidates' aptitude and willingness. Towards this purpose we have to make use of the latest findings in psychology, the practical applications of which are for the time being shelved, because education whether technical or otherwise to-day are determined by the amount one can afford to spend rather than by one's aptitude for the study concerned.

Education in all countries, not India alone, is being regarded as a means to earn a livelihood. Schools and colleges are for this reason the training centres for the army of clerks, technicians, assistants, and hirelings who are being recruited constantly by the privileged society to be directly exploited as workers or to be employed as tools for the more intense exploitation of society in general. The purpose of education in a socialist society is different from this. In a planned society education means training for citizenship and this training includes the basic knowledge

to be aware of citizenship responsibilities and enough technical knowledge to make the life of the citizen productive for himself and for the community in general. Such an education would not be complete by knowing the three Rs.

We are concerned in this chapter more with the primary and elementary stages of education than the higher and the technical sides, for after all these are required for special purposes and thereby follow channels essentially their own. We cannot for a long time to come expect every one to proceed for some such higher stages of study, for the general body of masses would be content with the primary stage and in some cases with elementary. To plan to keep every male and female child in school upto say fifteenth or sixteenth year itself is a stupendous problem for the country and to attempt beyond that from now on would be the height of folly. This would leave scope for an average of eight to ten years of schooling prior to the school leaving age, which can be made equivalent to the present high school or secondary stage with a lot more of useful training in various handicrafts and other useful occupations.

Ever since a serious appraisal of education and educational theory has been attempted, the idea of some sort of activity school has figured prominently in such discussions. Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Loche, Froebel, Fitch have all advocated the necessity for children being educated in conjunction with some useful activity and every sane educationist dead or living has supported the idea. In India Mahatma Gandhi has been one of the ardent supporters of the activity school and the basic education scheme, popularly known as Wardha Scheme is evidently inspired by this. However communal minded persons have given a different significance to this, but to our analysis it is immaterial whether the idea of the activity school is commensurate with the traditions of Islam, Hinduism or any other religion.

In spite of such widespread recognition of the benef-

icient results of the activity school, I should say present educational systems in almost all the countries totally disregard the principle. As pointed out earlier, the reason is not far to seek, as it is not in the interests of the capitalists or industrialists to make men and women develop on the lines of handicrafts or other self reliant occupations. To us in India, however, the method has double significance. Under the tyranny of a religious caste system, all those who follow some sort of handicrafts as means of livelihood for generations past are either untouchables, unapproachable or socially low people and the general adoption of the principle of the activity school would give us the opportunity better than anything else to make these very same people the *gurus* or teachers of the rising generation and the generations to follow. The staff of the activity schools in our villages will have to be drawn entirely from the village blacksmiths, carpenters, weavers, masons and artisans of all types giving them a social status and responsibility equal to, if not better than, the village Pandit, Labbe, Maulvi or Headman. Without adopting some such measure it would be impossible to eliminate caste prejudices, social distinctions, and to radicalise social relations on a thorough scale. At the same time these men and women, who would not have in the ordinary course shown any inclination to learning would be gradually drawn to educational pursuits thereby affording them the opportunity to improve their work and technical knowledge. Without developing the intellectual awareness of these craftsmen it would be impossible to bring out their latent inventive faculties and effect improvements in their crafts in the light of new advances in scientific knowledge. The India of the future cannot be planned on the same lines as Europe, or any other Western country, for India's problems are to a very great extent different from that of Europe, Russia or even China. The caste system is a particularly deep rooted system of social organisation in the villages and our villages

form the bedrock of Indian economy. Any programme of reorganisation therefore should take these factors into consideration.

Recent history has clearly vindicated that people who shape the destiny of nations, to-day, in common with the majority of the intelligentsia attach far too much of importance to mere intelligence as compared to common sense. This tendency is evident in the systems of education prevalent. I am reminded in this connection of Jean Jacques Rousseau's words "I don't like verbal explanations; young people pay little attention to them and scarcely retain them. Things! Things! I shall never repeat often enough that we give too much power to words; with our babbling education we make nothing but babblers." Intelligence is not the test of man's greatness, but his commonsense. This power to utilise commonsense correctly can never come out of this cramming or babbling business of ours.

Adolph Ferriere has done much in popularising the idea of the Activity School. The Indian Edition of his work by K. G. Saiyidain, in spite of the verbiage which is common to an enunciation of any new theory, is sufficiently enlightening on the subject. For our purpose, the subjects to be taught in the schools may include the following:

Agriculture, Farm work, Gardening, Bee-keeping, Sewing, Shoe-making, Laundering, Baking, Nursing, Earthwork, Masonry, Wood-working, Metal working, Painting, Glazing, Sculpture, Printing, Book-binding, Photography, Pottery, Carpentry, Tinsmithy, Poultry keeping, Dairy work, and a host of other useful trades and interesting occupations.

The activity school apart from its psychological and material advantages has a great social significance in the sense it can well turn out to be a centre of social service to the community. Articles made at the institutions can be distributed either among the children themselves or given to the needy or sold in the market to meet partly the cost

of maintenance of the workshops attached to these institutions. In conjunction with the youth movement and the Labor Front organisations children may be afforded the opportunity to serve the society in a thousand and one different ways. Character is never infused by precepts in an individual, it has got to be gained by one's own conscious efforts and no better training for developing character can be devised than the Activity School.

We have also to consider about the intellectual activity in such schools. In the Primary stages no attempt should be made to teach any language other than the mother tongue, while in the Elementary stage, children can be taught one other useful language, for example the National language, but until the High School stage foreign languages should not be included in the curriculum of school children. Of these foreign languages, by our past connection and by reason of its universal nature English has much in its favour of being adopted generally. Elements of Chemistry, Physics and Mechanics may be taught beginning with the first year or second year of the Elementary School class through the medium of the mother tongue, while civics and rudiments of social and political organisation can be introduced in the Primary stages itself in the form of small lessons in the place of what are now taught as the advantages of the British rule and the glory of the Empire on which the sun never sets and that there is more than one race in India.

I have tried in vain to find out any special advantages for segregating boys from girls in educational institutions. In the matter of education I don't think the needs of boys and girls are so different as to necessitate segregation of the two. Successive waves of puritanism only have kept this system in vogue in spite of reason dictating its abolition. It is this policy that makes us rear our women as animals for sex, and of course, we worship or respect them just as we do cows, but do not regard them as companions

or human beings.

In the sphere of adult education we cannot at present stipulate any hard and fast rule or system, because there is much less of data available on the subject when compared to children's education. But somehow or other we will have to tackle the problem on a considerably large scale to reduce the large amount of illiteracy prevalent. Where education through the written medium is impossible on account of advanced age or inaptitude visual education through cinemas and talkie projection methods should be adopted to make the people in the rural areas conscious of the living present and the progress around.

One thing we will have to radicalise in our educational practice is the present tendency to overelaborate things and weave all sorts of superfluous terminology and what not over silly subjects and waste the energy of students by introducing such artificially pedantic subjects for research and study in University classes. Knowledge should be simplified and wastage of effort in the pursuit of such artificial sciences should be put an end to. One can have an idea of what I mean by perusing some of the University theses, works on orthodox Economics, Logic, Philosophy, Philology, Archaeology and what not which contain very little substance but forbidding quotations and footnotes. This is the result of commercialising education, making high sounding University degrees essentials for bread winning. This is a tendency all throughout the capitalist countries and if you happen to read some of the text books on these subjects written by American authors, you would realise how foolish men are to over elaborate things just for the sake of earning their livelihoods. The greatest benefit I find in a social revolution is that it would make possible to utilise all these professional experts and lawyers to dig cabbage beds rather than waste their time and energy over such professions.

Even before a radical social reformation is accomplished

we need think over the present system of Arts education, I mean the education leading to the degrees of Bachelor of Arts, Master of Arts, etc. of Indian Universities. The money and effort wasted on these by the Universities can very well be utilised for technical education which need practical instruction. The needs of Arts students can be catered by creating External Departments to the various Universities to hold examinations, grant degrees and afford the necessary guidance to students preparing for these examinations. Presently Indian Universities do not have External Degrees simply because those who control them labour under the mistaken conception that by throwing open the Arts Degrees to external students they would be increasing the number of educated unemployed. Unemployment on a large scale is not a creation of the educational systems but the result of the economic structure the nature of which would not be affected even if you shut down all the Universities. On the contrary, if one has enough common sense one should desire to make it possible for millions and millions of our population to become University graduates, for that would benefit the country as a whole. Liberal education need not go by itself, technical students may, in their spare time, compete for Arts degrees, so also women and men engaged in the trades or other full time occupations. I would like to see every Indian, man or woman, an Arts graduate, if that can be helped, in the sense I would like to see every one of them possessing first rate general education in addition to their being expert technicians, agriculturists, journalists or book-keepers. We should not view education as a means for hall marking men for the sake of bread winning just like branding merchandise prior to marketing. If we have unemployed men why not they be educated, graduates all of them and why should it worry us if we have University graduates as shoe blacks. On the contrary, so much the better, the graduate shoe black by reason of his education

would be in a better position to devise means to make shoes shine better with less of effort or some such improvement that would make the task worth while. If we have University graduates as waiters in hotels, so much the better, for we are thereby making it possible for a hotel waiter to-day to become a President of our country some time later. Our educationists by their false conceptions are acting as accomplices against the spread of education generally.

It would not be an easy task for us to make such a transformation of our Universities, controlled as they are by vested interests. Even if we bring a legislation to make Arts education an external division of the Universities to enable them concentrate more on technical education including medicine, the measure would, in all probability, be referred to a commission of the best known pedants in the country possessing the highest University degrees, who would after deliberating for a long stretch of time, would turn down the scheme.

For these reasons, educational reform in the country is a matter of first rate political importance and should therefore form one of the main planks for political agitation, without which there is little hope of progressive educational ideals coming to public notice. Our Universities of late, instead of expanding, are trying to restrict the spread of higher education. In spite of the fact that we do not have enough number of doctors or technicians to meet the requirements of the country, seats for such studies are restricted by the lack of equipment and facilities which could very well be made available by curtailing the expenditure on Arts Colleges. Further our Universities indulge in the most un-national activities by imposing all sorts of barriers for inter-provincial understanding. Migration from one University to another in India, is a still very difficult proposition and these and various other matters cannot be successfully solved with things as they are. The entire range of education

should be brought under the control of one National body the purpose of which would be to spread education with the greatest rapidity to the largest possible extent and not manufacture men to suit the employment market. In the meanwhile an inquiry should be conducted into all un-national activities whereby education and technical training are restricted by adopting the old guild methods, for example, apprenticeships by paying premiums and stipulations as to experience as opposed to knowledge, etc., and to make recommendations for the revision of the entire system of education prevailing.

CHAPTER XII

Land Policy

Land being in the same way as air or water or the means of production cannot be made the basis for private exchange or be recognised as private property. However, this prospect of nationalisation of land has terrified the land holding classes in the country who have hitherto allied themselves with the forces of nationalism in so far as it serves their purpose. In India political progress is dependent on national independence, in the struggle for which it is unwise to isolate large sections of people, if we can help that reasonably. For this reason, the application of the principle of nationalisation of land has to be well thought out and so planned, as not to arouse any special kind of opposition, converting the heartening appeal into a grievous hurt.

Communist policy has always advocated the complete nationalisation or collectivization of land, but in spite of twenty five years of communist regime in Russia the principle is yet unrealised. Lenin in his New Economic Policy had to retrace his steps considerably and our policy in India should be to avoid initial errors as far as possible and proceed cautiously instead of plunging headlong and then having to step back.

The peasantry in any country has a far more deep-rooted attachment to the soil than other people to their worldly

possessions—the tradesman to his merchandise, the money lender to his money. In India this peasantry form the fountain reservoir of all life and to violently upset the equilibrium of these people would be fraught with grave dangers for the country on the whole leaving room for counter-revolution to raise its head amongst the widespread peasant discontent. Further the peasantry have always stood by the cause, wherever they have been aroused to it, without having any divided allegiance or vacillating tendency as the urban workers. They are wedded to the country and the cause just as they are to the soil they cultivate and they have only one spiritual homeland that is India. To them little matter what happens in Persia, Arabia, Turkey, Russia or Europe, their sense of patriotism is out of pure love or veneration for the soil which created them and which sustains them to-day and would sustain their progeny to-morrow. Born of peasant stock myself, I have tried my best to find a parallel among the working class to this sentiment, but with little success. Of course, the working class may show occasional fanatical attachment to a cause, but that is occasional and not a constantly flowing undiluted sentiment.

A progressive land policy for the country is absolutely essential, for without feeding the millions first it is useless to think of industries or progress. Agriculture is still carried on in the country in the most primitive manner. From the present rate of progress any widespread application of machinery for farming is still a very distant possibility, may take another fifty years, that means another two world wars. A vast country, rich in natural resources with a variety of temperature and climatic conditions from the tropic to the sub-tropic, temperate and cold regions affording possibilities for cultivation of distinct varieties of crops still remain poor with millions on her soil unfed. With ten years of concentrated effort the country can certainly equal and even surpass any European country

in her output of agricultural produce and be not only self-supporting but have enough surplus to pay for her imports. But that effort is not the same thing as the ceremonial presentation of stud bulls, by Viceroy's expatiating over the radio or in the press about such ceremonies. An agricultural department like so many other Government departments to create jobs for the chosen few collecting specimens of butterflies or few entomologists trucking on bicycles cannot accomplish that task. It can only be done by the extensive use of machinery for agriculture and by collectivization of small holdings to enable the use of such machinery. Giant tractor plants, huge dams and river encampments, afforestation of river beds, extensive training of rivers to avoid recurrent and seasonal floods and the setting up of powerful hydro-electric plants should precede all talks of agricultural reform. Rivers which should in the ordinary course sustain are a curse to the country by impoverishing its citizens, rendering them homeless, laying waste their lands and crops through seasonal floods. Such beautiful countryside as that of Bengal and Malabar reverberate with the moan of hungry and homeless millions, plains of the Central Provinces lay waste and barren and the whole of India is just one vast stretch of fallow uncultivated land. Cows look more like skeletons, and people just bones with pairs of piercing eyes to tell the pitiful tale of starvation, stark starvation everywhere. That is Mother India set to the drone of aeroplanes overhead.

Recognising the principle that land is a national asset instead of private property, the most reasonable procedure would be to nationalise straight away all land, which is uncultivated as on the date of decree. This would not involve hurt to anybody nor would it be an act of expropriation to be resented, but an extremely welcome measure which would add to the people's wealth. A beginning should be made to cultivate all such land through the help of machinery and large scale irrigation projects under state

acres and wherever possible as collective farms owned by the community. In respect of land which is under cultivation already, landlordism should be abolished and redistribution of these made on the basis of existing tenancy agreements and in an equitable way whereby all in the community would share the available land in an equal measure. Where such redistribution renders the land uneconomic for cultivation being too small a unit, resort should be made then to collectivize the entire holding. In case, where any parcel of land at present under cultivation remains fallow after such re-distribution on account of the new holder being unable to cultivate it for any reason, such parcels should also be brought under the collective system. The greatest incentive for collectivization should come from the practical results achieved by the farms under collective organization.

By adopting such a method of progressive collectivization by stages, we would be avoiding the blood baths of the Russian experiment. In addition the goodwill of the peasantry to the regime would not be forfeited, instead the bonds of friendship between the people and the state would be strengthened. By terrifying the people with the prospect of expropriation on a national scale we are sacrificing the very purpose of the social revolution, which after all is engineered for the sake of common good. Without being fully prepared and equipped for the task of extensive mechanisation of agriculture it is useless to rush headlong with collectivization. This initial preparation would take at least five years after the reconstruction of the state, which period should be devoted to the task of building up a sufficient number of tractors and agricultural implements with the necessary trained personnel for running the farms. Prior to automobiles or aeroplanes the country needs tractors, agricultural machinery and implements in huge quantities with giant irrigation projects to cultivate all land which have hitherto remained incapable of cultivation due

to scarcity of water. If that can be done the rest will follow and then collectivization would not be as difficult as it looks to-day.

In all our efforts we should be particularly careful not to give room for despotism to set in, for after all, the Government is intended for the people and their benefit. The humanitarian side of the regime and the selfless devotion to the cause on the part of the sponsors should be the abiding principles on which to rest hope for the future. Despotic careerism cannot succeed in the long run and perhaps that alone has made the lay people resentful of communist methods and communist propaganda. Without giving in on fundamentals there is ample room for mutual adjustment, toleration and kindly understanding. The clenched fist is not meant to be symbolic of despotic arrogance as the present day Communists think. Of all the interpreters of Marxism Lenin alone had the greatness to recognise the human element in politics. Instead of translating Stalinism, Trotskysm or Hitlerism to India let us have Gandhism and the humanitarian aspect of it combined with the realist ideology of Communism. India has lived in the eyes of the world for the humanism she has upheld through the ages and the deep glow the teachings have left on her millions.

What good is a Government, if that Government has got to shoot poor peasants by the hundreds, starve them by the thousands or transplant them body and soul from one region to another forcibly, in the administration of its policy ? The landlord or the Zamindar may be dealt with sternly and pitilessly, if they try to put obstacles or evade the provisions of law, but the poor peasants deserve every sympathy.

CHAPTER XIII

Industrialisation

The progress of society cannot be stopped, however hard we may try to do so. To dream of going back to the days of yore, with its bucolic simplicity and self-sufficiency is neither possible nor desirable.

This, of course, does not mean that we can countenance the present state of things, the terrifically over-crowded cities with their slum-dwellers and extensive unemployment on the one hand, and poverty and disease stricken villages, famine, and epidemics on the other. We can end all that with our present knowledge and resources, without trying to set back the pace of history and large scale disease and penury, plan cities which would accommodate only what could be accommodated healthily, organise agricultural communities who will enjoy all modern amenities like electricity, sanitation and transport, produce what we need and assure necessary leisure for all, for relaxation and enjoyment. The capitalist organisation of industry is the greatest single factor that is responsible for the ills of the world. Industry planned to produce the needs of the people, elastic enough to cater to the changing tastes and wants producing nothing more than what is needed, at the places most suited for its production within the country with the least expenditure of energy and time, should replace the present haphazard growth of production. What I mean is that

industry must be so planned as to satisfy the needs of various sections of the people, diverse as human wants are and produce from articles of consumption, automobiles and railway carriages to latex sheaths and lipsticks.

This can be achieved only by the state exercising control over industry, though the actual management of the concerns may be left to individuals, workers' councils, peoples' co-operatives, collective farms or other peasant organisations. This control should extend from the planning of production to distribution of products to the people. The second World War has taught even the capitalist countries, that this control of production and distribution is thoroughly feasible and helps to provide full scale employment for the people.

In the early stages it would not be possible to take over the entire ownership and management of industry on the whole nor would that be desirable unless proper plans are prepared in advance, stipulating production based on the estimated needs of the people and the details of technical direction. It is unwise to build the foundations of the new state on blood and strife, where that could be avoided. The ghastly nature of the Russian revolution and the subsequent reign of terror have chilled the enthusiasm of many, who would have otherwise remained ardent admirers of the new political experiment. Moreover, it would be impossible to perfect the plans for production and technical direction, without having adequate data and trained personnel and both cannot be accomplished without exercising political power for at least a few years.

It is premature to lay down any dictum as to whether cottage industries should be encouraged at the expense of large scale industries, for in these matters the conditions pertaining to each branch of industry have to be considered. In one particular case, it would be found desirable to produce the article concerned under the auspices of the collective farm or the people's co-operatives as a cottage

industry, in the interests of rural economy and to organise rural centres in a self-supporting manner to ward off foreign aggression and consequential dislocation of transport arrangements. In such case no political dogma should stand in the way of giving effect to such a policy nor should a decision in favour of large scale industry where found desirable be fettered by political considerations.

Economy and speed in the matter of production should be the prime factors for consideration, for no state is worth the people's support unless it assures adequate leisure for its citizens. Speeding up the tempo of production in the interests of national planning in the first years and thereby putting an additional strain on the toilers may be necessary but that should not be allowed to continue as a policy and the greatest watchfulness should be exercised in this matter.

India of all nations, barring perhaps Canada and the United States offers the greatest scope for hydro-electric development and in the effort to drive out superstition and bigotry from the rural population the first step should be to carry electricity to every house, farm and village in the country.

In the matter of transportation it is a tragic factor that a little over forty thousand miles of railways should serve a country of one million eight hundred and six thousand square miles in the midspan of the twentieth century. There are over seven lakhs of villages in the country shut off from the outside world for want of adequate number of rail tracks and roadways. During the past quarter of a century no worthwhile new rail track or major roadways have been constructed, in spite of the fact that the country's transport facilities and communication systems have been woefully lagging behind.

From housing to providing agricultural tractors and harvesting machines, from railroads to aerial highways, from sanitation to hospitals and maternity homes, from hydro-electric plants to large scale irrigation projects, India's

industrial needs are stupendous, but it is not a question of how many crores of Rupees these would cost, but how soon we can provide these amenities for the people.

CHAPTER XIV

Peasant And Working-Class Organisation

To isolate Trade Unions and Peasant organisations from the political life of a country is impossible, in fact the most active political elements are these two sets of people. The welfare of the peasantry and the working classes are so closely linked with the political organisation prevailing, it becomes increasingly necessary to associate more and more the representatives of these organisations with the administration. Under Communism though the party represents the interests of peasants and working classes to the exclusion of all other sections of the people, scope is afforded for separate trade unions and peasant organisations to function independent of the party though not counter to the general programme and policy of the party. Fascism's cardinal principle is the suppression of trade unionism and peasant organisation with a view to regimentation of both the workers and the peasants to suit the party's political programme.

In our country the sphere of trade union activity has been seriously contested between rival political parties and communal organisations. From the wrecking tactics of the Communists to the lukewarm politics of the orthodox congressmen the trade union movement in the country has passed through various vicissitudes and has not been stabilised yet to be of any major political significance. Torn between two sets of ideologies and paper boats in

between let drift by the so-called Radical Democrats the working classes are still far from organised and their conditions would remain so until such time the entire trade union movement is re-organised on more rational lines. So long as the Communist Party of India was in the wilderness unions organised by individual members of the party had only one programme, that of bringing the conflict between the employer and the worker sharper and sharper by calling strikes for every conceivable object.

The peasant movement in India is much younger to the Trade Union movement, but of late this sphere also has been invaded by rival political parties, and it is to be anticipated that the Kisan Sabhas will also pass through the same vicissitudes and reach the same unsettled conditions as its sister movement, if these have not reached that stage already.

It is neither in the interests of the working class or the peasantry to remain isolated from the main political body or to pull in different directions. To us in India there are two phases to be considered in our political development, one prior to the achievement of national independence and the other subsequent to such achievement. In the first phase all political activities are centred round the major issue that is winning freedom, though in such attempt to enlarge the scope of activity and to draw the maximum support from various quarters programmes for the amelioration of social conditions are brought in. How far these programmes could be fulfilled by the party constituted as such without weeding out its ranks or resolving into divergent elements is a matter for speculation. One thing can be safely predicted that for a few years immediate to the achievement of political freedom, the party winning the battle would be saddled in power, and it is in the best interests of all that the party shape its ideology bearing in mind this factor.

Now let us consider what should be the conditions for

the organisation of the Trade Unions and the Kisan Sabhas during the first phase. Since the maximum political collaboration from these organisations would be *vitaly necessary* for the success of any political action *contemplated by the major political party* it should be assured that the organisation of these bodies do not leave room for gravitation in different directions. This can be done only by merging the Trade Unions and the peasant organisations in the major political party or organising them as divisions of the party. Under the present law regarding Trade Unions this may have certain disabilities, but that should not mean these laws are beyond rectification if attacked frontally. Admitting that the Indian National Congress is the major political party it would be necessary that its constitution be so drafted as to provide for representation of Trade Unions and Peasant organisations both in the A. I. C. C. and the Working Committee. This can be done by making the election to the A. I. C. C. and the Committees to be done through three different panels consisting of the general, Trade Union and peasant electorates. The number of members each of the electorate can return to the A. I. C. C. would depend on the ratio of the General electorate to the total number of workers and peasants in the country. In an agricultural country like India the fact that peasants would preponderate over the workers would rather deter the trade unions from acting upon the suggestion, but it should be remembered that in any political organisation the representation of various elements should be proportionate to their numerical strength if democracy is to survive. It is possible that in such Committees coalition of workers' delegates with peasants' representatives would be likely as opposed to the general electorate since there would be more grounds for common agreement between these two groups. Following the present principle for the sake of assuring the smooth functioning the Working Committee Members are to be

nominated by the President, the constitution should be so altered as to make it incumbent on the President to select workers and peasants delegates from the A. I. C. C. to the Working Committee in the same ratio as the composition of the A. I. C. C.

Such a method of organising the Trade Unions and the Kisan Sabhas directly linked with the major political party is in the interests of all concerned. The workers and the peasants in their bargaining or struggle will have the confidence that they are backed by a national organisation and their interests thereby become a national interest. Neither the employers nor the Government can, in such an event, take the demands of the workers or peasants lightly. In the same way the party will gain immense political strength for the reason that the party can count upon the backing of the entire working class and the peasantry to whatever decision the national executive is forced to take and which decision would be in fact the decision of the workers and the peasants through their elected representatives. This is the only method whereby mushroom trade unionists, political parasites and their activities opposed to the general will and national interests can be effectively curbed.

In the second phase of development also, that is after winning political freedom an almost similar method or policy can be adopted for the organisation of Trade Unions and Kisan Sabhas whereby they would be sharing in political power, shaping the national policy and serving their own needs. It would be argued that such an organisation approaches totalitarian methods, affords little or no opportunity for opposition voice to be heard and helps to pass the control of the entire political, trade union and peasant organisation into one hand. As opposed to this it must be admitted that some such sort of organisation alone can assure a stable political organisation for the country in the place of much loose thinking and conflicting

Now let us consider what should be the aims and objects of trade union and peasant activity. The first and foremost is the question of providing work for all and living wage for that work. The war has proved beyond doubt that full scale employment can be provided if the politics of the country is so planned. From this some one would go to the extent of suggesting a perpetual war to solve the unemployment problem or a war to which the brakes are applied properly and which applies to one section only leaving the rest all comfortable. The question of providing work for every adult man and woman is not at all difficult when we consider the magnitude of the tasks confronting us, that of feeding the four hundred millions, clothing, housing, educating and providing adequate leisure and recreation for all of them. Our aim should be to employ all and not to over-work one section leaving the rest idle. Not a single healthy adult man or woman should be left alone from the enforcement of this provision, the necessity to work, nor should a single individual in the state be left alone from receiving a weekly or monthly pay check, whether man, woman, child or invalid. In the case of invalids it would be either gratuity or pension from the state funds and for children it would be the proportionate deduction from both the parents' wages.

To all purposes forty hours a week should be the maximum time an individual should be employed, uniformly in all walks of occupation. The rest of the time should be a matter of concern for the individual himself either to be spent in relaxation, study or social service. The responsibility for guiding the proper utilisation of leisure should fall on the state and the workers and peasants organisations. I should think forty hours a

week should be a minimum condition as well and the large scale employment of machinery might make it possible to reduce this number, but in that event the excess production would tend to increase the standard of life and national resources. To us Russia should not be an example in these respects nor the type of Communism worked out there should be regarded as the last word. Russia to-day moves in Stalin's path and if Stalin aspires to be Peter the Great, Russian Communism may even turn out to be a new Tsarism of Stalin's order. In Russia, women are worked sixty six hours a week, men eighty four and if reports prove true, children are worked as hard as the adults. To us our national economy should not be geared to war, but if we need fight a war, we must be able to put on the field the largest number of men, materials and equipment.

Nor in the matter of wage scale for workers and in the inequality in income among different sections of the population should we follow Russia's present policy. Madam Molotov can own all the wealth or a Stakhanovite earn ten times an ordinary worker what use to us is Stalin's brand of Socialism. We have to level down the inequality in the income levels of the people, to what extent we cannot say now for that would depend on the conditions prevailing at that time, but one thing is to be made sure that no section of the population should be made to live like animals while others are allowed to have all the luxuries. Since housing should be nationally distributed in as equitable a manner as possible without rent deduction from the earnings, the wage levels should be so fixed as to assure adequate food, clothing and essential comforts of life for all people irrespective of past antecedents. To be certain that we do not begin the Government with blood baths and wholesale liquidation nor by denial of citizenship rights, we may have to retain some of the present owners of Industry and technical personnel at higher wages, as a temporary measure, to make the transition from capitalism to the new order

smooth in its working.

To substitute capitalism by a managerial state is not a prospect that appeals to one's mind nor the substitution of an owning class by a class of bureaucrats or rentiers. Peoples' control over industry can be real and effective if only the workers engaged in each individual plant establishment or industry share in the day to day administration of these in partnership with the managers who may be employed for the purpose of technical direction. This function of sharing in the administration can be effected through workers' councils on each establishment elected by the workers of the respective plants or through representatives nominated to the Board of Management by the trade unions. Both of these procedures may have the effect of reducing the efficiency in the working of these establishments by instilling political talk and squabbles into the daily routine of administration. There are a large number of people in any community who are professional idlers, whom people generally mistake as politically conscious or politically inclined people. Political parties in India today are also full of these conscious idlers who have an exaggerated sense of their own importance and who can do nothing else but blabbering. India's politics will never take a constructive turn unless we take steps to eliminate these political idlers who cannot earn their bread by honest work and who can not gain public attention by disinterested service. It is likely that the workers' councils will be monopolised by these people to the detriment of the whole cause unless conditions are laid down that representatives should be selected on the basis of their efficiency and past record of work, than the flair for political tall talk.

Peasants' share in the organisation of collective farms can be very real and effective since there would be less necessity for the importation of managing personnel from outside their ranks. Technical personnel engaged in the operation of tractors and agricultural machinery would be

subject to their discipline so that the farmers need not be afraid, as the industrial workers, of being bossed over by quite another section of people.

Adequate medical attention and hospital accommodation organised by the state and maternity care for every woman alone can ensure the national well being, but to leave the control over these to the peasant organisations or the Trade Unions seems to be impractical and unnecessary. These are actually state functions and the only assistance workers or peasants could do would be the reinforcement of the state machinery by co-operation to stamp out corruption and to make the people conscious of their duty.

Provision of insurance facilities against unemployment, old age and sickness is an extension of the capitalist method to the service of socialism, but since the method has been found to be working well in the new role it is unnecessary to think of an alternative method at this stage. When national planning permits functions to be enlarged alternative methods may be devised in the place of insurance.

To link the agricultural economy of the country with the industrial life and to forge the unity of the people and to present them a whole panoramic view of the nation's growing economy it would be a wise plan for the Trade Unions and the Peasant organisations to co-operate in the organisation of mass holiday parties spread throughout the year, whereby urban workers would spend seasonal holidays in the villages and the peasants their vacation in the cities. Such a plan would be of immense help in weeding the people away from the clutches of religious dogmatism and give them the facility for studying social conditions by actual contact, which would in turn help to enlarge their mental vision and afford them the opportunity for social inter-mixture. This must not sound utopian, but a perfectly possible picture of the state to come, if we want to save civilization from the ravages of war mongers.

CHAPTER XV

States and states' people

In any question of political development for India, the problem of the Indian states numbering six hundred and one with annual revenues ranging from eighty rupees to eight crores and populations ranging from twenty seven people to fourteen crores confront us. Their problem cannot be dismissed lightly ; in area these states occupy as much as three quarters the size of British India, and in population they approximate to one-third of the population directly under British control. This vast mass of people indistinguishable from the rest are however in a semi feudal state of development, enjoying no political rights for no fault of theirs except that they are born in certain tracts of land demarcated by foreign authority as the latter's last stronghold. Some of the rulers or kings are in charge of kingdoms not exceeding one square mile in area and there are seventy such states in India and nearly three times this number have kingdoms extending to less than ten square miles in area.

You cannot term their Governments as autocratic, for there is a limit to their autocracy and that is the interest of the paramount power, but you would be perfectly right if you call their system of Government ante-diluvian. And some of them have no Governments at all. These Rajas and Maharajas exist under the sweet will of the crown and

can be removed from the thrones for any reason whatsoever, either for not marrying or for marrying too many wives or for erotic misbehaviour. The crowns' representative combines in him the role of an administrator, ambassador, and secret service boss who in his day to day life typifies the white Burra Saheb of the colonial hemisphere.

The number of states in which there are Legislative Councils hardly number thirty and even then these Councils have preponderance of nominated members over elected representatives and the Rulers are under no obligation to accept the verdict of such Councils. Only forty states have High Courts and in a less number the judiciary is separated from the executive. Electoral and civic rights are absent in a vast majority of Indian States.

Various people have recommended different solutions to the peculiar problem of the Indian States, from that of Federation, regrouping of the major states after absorbing the smaller states, annexation to British territory by incorporating these states in the Provinces to that of gradual evolution to constitutional development by the impact of time. The solutions reflect the mentality of the people sponsoring these from the orthodox to the liberal, but none of these solutions can satisfy the subjects of these states.

The problems of the Indian states people are in no way different from that of the rest of the population of India and any political solution that applies to India should equally well apply to them. Theirs is as much a problem of life and liberty as ours. Once this is realised the rest of the planning is simple enough. To link our political activity with theirs should be the first aim and this can be done only by our political organisations taking direct interest in the states' politics not through subsidiary organisations as done uptil now. We have to face the challenge boldly and squarely and in this minor considerations of button-holing one ruler or winning the support of another should

not stand in the way.

The different state Congresses and Praja Mandals as organised at present serve no political purpose whatsoever, they are children's parties just as our politics to-day is a game of hide and seek. You air your views for some time bravely and then set the other lads to catch you and lock you up to prove your great self sacrifice. But that type of politics cannot and will not accomplish what is desired of political activity. We have to put more guts in the whole show.

The Praja Mandals and the State Congresses can be crushed like mushrooms with no noise being made for outside ears, and in fact that has been the fate of almost all the state political parties. It would be a different story altogether if the major political party in the country were to function in each of these states openly with declared political intentions. Any attempt to crush a limb would set the whole body and nerves acting in a way if that be necessary, very very unpleasant to those who attempt at crushing. It should be made patent to whoever be at the top that people's rights and liberties are not to be trampled or regarded as light and inconsequential. To plan the lives of our people we are to-day placed in an extremely difficult position of having to challenge the mightiest powers in the world and when we embark on that it is unwise to stoop to stone statues.

The policy of the Indian National Congress towards the states peoples' movement for freedom is defined by the Haripura Resolution of the Congress (1938) which is a compromise between the old and the new methods. This policy has failed to produce appreciable results though Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru seems to be carried away by the wisdom and statesmanship underlying the compromising attitude, as evidenced by his Presidential Address to the All India States Peoples Conference held at Ludhiana in 1939. During the same speech however we hear him

expressing the most radical of views and sensible solutions like Gandhiji himself who has more than once declared that the freedom of the states peoples are inextricably bound with the freedom of the people of the rest of India. Compromise is a sign of weakness for us to-day, we have built up strength by fighting and we have to grow stronger in the same way, fighting so that we shall win in the end.

The existence of states or monarchies within the borders of India are incompatible with the post freedom phase of our political development. Then these States will have to be annexed to the neighbouring provinces, of course, the provinces being regrouped on the basis of linguistic areas. The Rulers of the States shall enjoy no more privileges than the ordinary citizen and in matters of civic rights there would be no difference between a ruler, a former state subject and an Indian citizen. It would be unwise to deny the privileged classes of to-day citizenship rights in the society of to-morrow, for by that we would be ourselves sowing the seeds of counter-revolution. The risk is well worth taking of affording these classes the opportunity to grow as normal citizens and instead of willingly making use of the opportunity for good if their energies are directed to counter-revolutionary activities appropriate agencies could be devised to nip these in the bud.

Apart from political considerations and peoples' rights the whole idea of being a puppet monarch is something repulsive and the devolution of political power through heredity is opposed to all canons of justice applicable to present day society. Monarchy in the future must be non-existent.

Around some of the Indian States are pivoted the most anti-national of political agitations to-day. Kashmir, a predominantly Muslim State ruled by a Hindu Raja and Hyderabad, a predominantly Hindu State ruled by a Muslim Nizam are the two danger spots. Muslim communalists build their vision of Pakistan with the Nizam of Hyderabad

dominating the empire of the Beloved, while the Hindu Mahasabhaites show a very special interest in the Maharaja of Kashmir and the administration of that state. If that unfortunate mishap of a civil war occurs these two areas will observe the most grievous of episodes and in India a civil war is very likely on the issue of Pakistan. The illiteracy of the people in these states makes the prospect worse and one should thank the stars if India escapes this calamity in good time.

The problem of the states is confusing only if we view it in the traditional way. Once the principle is accepted that the best guardians of peoples' rights are people themselves, we have less reason to be bothered about the sacro-sanctity or inviolability of established institutions. In a country nurtured in tradition and where changes have been brought about with great difficulty with long intervals of stagnation, cultural, economic and political deterioration such drastic reforms seem terrifying, and perhaps that is the reason why the most radical among our politicians turn soft over such delicate issues. I for one believe that the backwardness of India is an advantage to us those who think of radically reforming the whole system for that affords us the liberty to pull down the whole edifice without having to care for salvaging anything of value in the process. Our task would be simpler and quicker and what we build would be all new suited to the present time and environments.

CHAPTER XVI.

Declaration of Rights.

After having discussed the various factors concerning our political and social organisation, we shall now sum up the conclusions in the form of a declaration of the principles and the rights of citizens.

1. Politics is the means to an end, the end being the good of society, the maximum good for the maximum number.
2. The basis of society or social organisation shall be the individual and not the family, community, or nation.
3. There shall be no distinction in this between man, woman and child.
4. The state is an administrative expediency to ensure the good of society and for this reason is real, while the conceptions Nation and Nationalism are unreal and irrational and serve only emotional needs.
5. A state is not validly constituted if it does not ensure the good of all.
6. The maximum good of the maximum number can only be ensured if the maximum number of people take part directly or indirectly in the administration of the state.
7. The people's will shall be represented by the party evolved on the principle of the largest measure of

- common agreement, ultimately the party permeating the whole of society and government.
8. Service of society shall be the test for individual advancement.
 9. All citizens of a state shall have equal rights, equal opportunities and equal responsibilities.
 10. Orderly life with the maximum of liberty for the individual with the least of interference on other people's liberty, worked out in a non-violent and peaceful manner shall be the aim of society, though this shall not restrict the choice of other means for the attainment of the same object.
 11. Every citizen shall be required to take part in the defence of the country, the state and his civic rights.
 12. Women shall enjoy equal liberties with men in all walks of life and shall have equal rights.
 13. Marriage shall not be construed as a rigid social institution, but an auxiliary development in the regulation of which individual discretion and liking shall be the basic factors and for this reason contraction of marriage and dissolution shall be easy and practical.
 14. The contraction of marriage and divorce shall be regulated by civil law and not by religion.
 15. Both the parents shall equally contribute to the maintenance and welfare of the offspring.
 16. Religion shall be a personal affair and religious life shall not interfere with social or political organisation, nor religious laws or customs be recognised as valid in the matter of social intercourse.
 17. Maximum opportunity shall be afforded for the development of the languages and culture of the people, but this shall not stand in the way of exploring the possibilities of evolving a common language and culture for the entire people to encourage homogeneous development in the place of heterogeneous

outgrowths.

18. Citizenship of the state shall be regarded as a matter of proud privilege and not racial affinities or characteristics.
19. There shall be no distinction between minority communities and majority communities, society being reduced to its element the individual; all individuals shall rank equal, enjoy equal rights and privileges.
20. Education shall be compulsory upto a certain standard for all, while all education shall be free and organised by the state.
21. All land shall devolve on the people equally, but the state shall exercise the right of trusteeship over it in the interests of the people and organise its cultivation and regulate its occupation.
22. Industries shall be organised to meet the requirements of the people and not for the sake of profit and accordingly its organisation shall be controlled by the state or people's representatives.
23. Every adult man and woman shall be required to work and the state shall provide work for all.
24. There shall be the least of restraint on the freedom of speech, assembly and expression of the people, the regulations in this respect to be evolved by the people themselves.

